


GREEK · SCULPTURE
ITS · SPIRIT · AND · PRINCIPLES



EDMUND · von · MACH

aly
450



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

GIFT OF
WILLIAM A. NITZE


Wm. A. Kitz—

Baltimore, Md.

GREEK SCULPTURE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation





DEMETER OF KNIDOS
(British Museum)

GREEK SCULPTURE

ITS SPIRIT AND PRINCIPLES

BY

EDMUND VON MACH, PH.D.

BOSTON, U.S.A.

GINN & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS

The Athenæum Press

1903

COPYRIGHT, 1903

By EDMUND VON MACH

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Art
Library

NB

90

M18g

TO
MY MOTHER
WHOSE BEAUTIFUL LIFE
HAS KINDLED IN ME
THE PASSION FOR BEAUTY
AND TO
MY WIFE
I DEDICATE THIS BOOK

967080

PREFACE

Greek sculpture is much admired but little known. The ancient statues for years have been studied as interesting curios rather than as things alive. The dead have no claims upon us; the living alone can teach us, and Greek sculpture is not dead. The vitality of its spirit and of its principles is such that it has outlasted centuries and deserves a wider recognition than it commonly receives.

This book is addressed to all students of art, to executing artists, and to the general public. It is designed in the first place to give pleasure, without which the study of art is impossible, and in the second place to be serviceable to all serious students not only by the presentation of the most important subjects but also by the suggestion of others, the treatment of which lies outside the scope of an art book.

For the benefit of the reader the book is divided in two parts. The lessons drawn from Greek sculpture are presented first. The order may be inverted, however, with the exception of Part I, Chapters V–VIII, on the principles of relief sculpture, which ought to be read before one enters on the study of the Parthenon, Part II, Chapters XVIII and XIX.

This book contains no multitude of details. Monuments which are omitted may be readily inserted, however, and may thus help to enforce the lessons taught by those monuments which are discussed. After the pediments of the temple of Zeus in Olympia, for instance, Part II, Chapter XVI, the metopes of the same temple may be studied; and in connection with the Parthenon, Part II, Chapters XVIII and XIX, many contemporaneous temple sculptures may find their place. In order to facilitate such a use of the book the author purposes to issue a collection of about five hundred reproductions of Greek statues and reliefs in uniform size. The large Brunn-Arndt collection of plates published by the Bruckmann Company in Munich, or similar collections of photographs, may serve the same purpose. Suggestions in this direction will be found in the Notes.

The author is indebted to his pupils and his friends for their enthusiasm and interest. He owes special thanks to Dr. J. F. Coar, Messrs. P. W. Long and G. C. Hirst, and to the members of the Editorial Department of Ginn & Company for great kindness and many valuable suggestions.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
October, 1903.

CONTENTS

PART ONE

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	1
II. GREEK SCULPTURE IN ITS RELATION TO NATURE: THE MENTAL IMAGE	8
III. THE APPEAL OF GREEK SCULPTURE	17
IV. THE ARTIST AND HIS PUBLIC	29
V. THE PRINCIPLES OF GREEK RELIEF SCULPTURE . . .	37
VI. THE DIFFERENT TECHNIQUE OF HIGH AND LOW RELIEF SCULPTURE	46
VII. GREEK RELIEF SCULPTURE IN ITS RELATION TO ARCHI- TECTURE: RELIEFS ON ROUNDED SURFACES	53
VIII. PHYSICAL EFFORT AND PLEASURE OF LOOKING AT EXTENDED COMPOSITIONS	60
IX. THE COLORING OF GREEK SCULPTURE	67
X. ART CONDITIONS BEFORE THE SEVENTH CENTURY B.C. .	79
XI. MATERIAL, TECHNIQUE, DESTRUCTIVE FORCES, EARLY IGNORANCE, AND SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE	91

PART TWO

XII. THE FIRST ATTEMPTS: IN THE ROUND	103
XIII. THE FIRST ATTEMPTS: IN RELIEF	123
XIV. CONSERVATISM; READY SKILL BEFORE FREEDOM OF CONCEPTION	144

CHAPTER	PAGE
XV. BROKEN FETTERS: A PERIOD OF TRANSITION	158
XVI. SCULPTURED TEMPLE DECORATIONS	178
XVII. REALIZATION OF THE NOBLEST IDEAS: THE DIVINE SIDE OF HUMAN NATURE	202
XVIII. THE PARTHENON. I. METOPES AND FRIEZE	211
XIX. THE PARTHENON. II. THE PEDIMENTS.	231
XX. THE HUMAN BODY	248
XXI. THE INDIVIDUAL: SOUL AND BODY	262
XXII. FORMULATED PRINCIPLES; PERFECT SKILL	290
XXIII. AUTUMN DAYS	299
NOTES	319
BIBLIOGRAPHY	343
INDEX	347
PLATES	359

ILLUSTRATIONS

The illustrations are from original photographs unless otherwise stated. The majority are reproductions of photographs and of plates in the Harvard University collections, for the use of which the author is greatly indebted to the courtesy of the curator, Professor Charles H. Moore, and of the librarian, Mr. W. C. Lane.

Illustrations which are taken from the Brunn-Arndt collection of plates are marked B. A., with the numbers of the plates added.

FULL-PAGE ILLUSTRATIONS

	FACING PAGE
Demeter of Knidos: London, British Museum	<i>Frontispiece.</i>
Bust of Perikles: London, British Museum	2
Sophokles: Rome, Lateran Museum	8
Apollo from Olympia: Olympia Museum	18
Nike of Samothrace: Paris, Louvre Museum	30
Horsemen, west frieze of Parthenon: Athens (in original position on Parthenon; B. A., 503)	38
Amazons, frieze of Maussoleion: London, British Museum	46
Battle scene, frieze of Theseion: Athens, Theseion (B. A., 407)	54
East and west friezes of Parthenon (from Michaelis, <i>Der Parthenon</i> , Pls. IX and XIV)	60
"Venus Genetrix": Paris, Louvre Museum	68
"Apollo" of Tenea: Munich, Glyptothek	80
Artemis of Gabii: Paris, Louvre Museum	92
Figure from the bottom of the sea: Athens, National Museum	100
"Hera" of Samos: Paris, Louvre Museum	106
Hermes and a "Grace": Paris, Louvre Museum	134
Akropolis figure (head): Athens, Akropolis Museum	144
Aristogeiton: Naples Museum (B. A., 326)	158
Discus Thrower, after Myron: London, British Museum	168
Spearman of Aigina: Munich, Glyptothek	178
Peirithoös (head): Olympia Museum	188
Lemnian Athena (head): Bologna Museum (from Furtwängler, <i>Meisterwerke</i> , Pl. III)	202
Seated gods, east frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum	212
Horsemen, west frieze, Parthenon: Athens (in original position on Parthenon)	218
The "Three Fates," east pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum	232
Hera (head from Argos, correct view): Athens, National Museum	248
Hermes of Praxiteles (head): Olympia Museum	262

	FACING PAGE
Maussolos: London, British Museum	286
Apoxyomenos, after Lysippos: Rome, Vatican Museum	296
Aphrodite of Melos (correct view): Paris, Louvre Museum	300
Pergamon altar (reconstructed) and one slab: Berlin, Pergamon Museum	314
Dying Gaul: Rome, Capitoline Museum	316
Athena slab, Pergamon altar: Berlin, Pergamon Museum	322

PLATES

	PLATE	FIGURE
Base from Mantinea: Athens, National Museum	I	1
Slab, east frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum	I	2
Spartan tombstone: Berlin Museum (B. A., 227 a)	I	3
Grave relief ("Ino-Leukothea"): Rome, Villa Albani	I	4
Cow, south frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum	II	1
Relief from Assos: Paris, Louvre Museum	II	2
Warriors, Athena-Nike temple frieze: London, British Museum (B. A., 118)	II	3
Egyptian standing figure: Gizeh Museum	III	1
Stele by Alxenor: Athens, National Museum	III	2
Stele of Aristion by Aristokles: Athens, National Museum	III	3
Stele of Lyseas (painted): Athens, National Museum	III	4
Gate of Lionesses: Mycenæ	IV	1
Strangford "Apollo": London, British Museum	IV	2
"Apollo" of Thera: Athens, National Museum	IV	3
"Apollo" of Orchomenos: Athens, National Museum	IV	4
Flying figure from Delos: Athens, National Museum	V	1
Tyrannicides: Naples Museum	V	2
Nike of Paionios: Olympia Museum	V	3
"Harpy" tomb frieze: London, British Museum	VI	1-4
Relief from Thasos: Paris, Louvre Museum	VII	1-3
Akropolis figure (earliest): Athens, Akropolis Museum	VIII	1
Akropolis figure (later): Athens, Akropolis Museum	VIII	2
Akropolis figure (overdelicacy): Athens, Akropolis Museum	VIII	3
Hera of Olympia (head): Olympia Museum	IX	1
Bearded warrior (head): Athens, Akropolis Museum	IX	2
Akropolis figure (fantastic curls): Athens, Akropolis Museum	IX	3
Akropolis figure (simple head): Athens, Akropolis Museum	IX	4
Centaur and girl, Olympia: Olympia Museum	X	1
Marsyas, after Myron: Rome, Lateran Museum	X	2
Centaur and girl, Parthenon metope: London, British Museum	X	3
Athlete ("Apollo" with the Omphalos): Athens, National Museum	XI	1
Charioteer of Delphi: Delphi Museum (after <i>Monuments Piot</i> , IV, Pl. XV)	XI	2
Athlete (Choiseul-Gouffier "Apollo"): London, British Museum	XI	3

	PLATE	FIGURE
Elevation of Temple of Aigina (reconstructed)	XII	1
View of Parthenon	XII	2
Figures of south corner of east pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XII	3
Figures of north corner of east pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XII	4
Dying warrior, from Aigina: Munich, Glyptothek	XIII	1
Dying warrior, from Aigina (cast, arm removed)	XIII	2
"Kladeos," east pediment, Olympia: Olympia Museum	XIII	3
"Kephissos," west pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XIII	4
Plan of Olympia pediments (from Overbeck, <i>Griechische Skulp- tur</i> , Fig. 77)	XIV	1
Carrey's drawings of the Parthenon pediments (from Overbeck, <i>Griechische Skulptur</i> , Fig. 103)	XIV	2
Typhon, pedimental decoration: Athens, Akropolis Museum	XIV	3
Center, east pediment, Olympia: Olympia Museum	XIV	4
Center, west pediment, Aigina: Munich, Glyptothek	XV	1
North corner, east pediment, Olympia: Olympia Museum . . .	XV	2
Maidens, east frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum . .	XV	3
Fragments from Argos: Athens, National Museum	XV	4
Peirithoös of Olympia (wrong view): Olympia Museum	XVI	1
Hera of Argos (wrong view): Athens, National Museum . . .	XVI	2
Huge apobates, north frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XVI	3
Plan of arrangement of Parthenon frieze	XVI	4
Lemnian Athena: Furtwängler's arrangement (from Furtwäng- ler's <i>Meisterwerke</i> , Pl. II)	XVII	1
Caryatid: London, British Museum	XVII	2
"Theseus," east pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XVIII	1
Helios and horses, east pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XVIII	2
Selene's horse, east pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XVIII	3
Niobid Chiaramonti: Rome, Vatican Museum	XIX	1
"Nike," east pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum . .	XIX	2
Iris, east pediment, Parthenon: London, British Museum . . .	XIX	3
Rapid movement, north frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XX	1
Beginning of cavalcade, north frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XX	2
End of cavalcade, north frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XX	3

	PLATE	FIGURE
Slower movement, north frieze, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XX	4
Conquered centaur, metope, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XXI	1
Conquered Greek, metope, Parthenon: London, British Museum	XXI	2
Doryphoros (Spear Bearer), after Polykleitos: Naples Museum	XXII	1
Vaison Diadoumenos, after Polykleitos: London, British Museum (B. A., 272)	XXII	2
Delian Diadoumenos, after Polykleitos: Athens, National Museum	XXII	3
Doryphoros (head): Naples Museum	XXIII	1
Doryphoros (bronze Herme, from Herculaneum): Naples Museum	XXIII	2
Head from Argos: Athens, National Museum	XXIII	3
Belvedere Apollo (head): Rome, Vatican Museum	XXIII	4
Berlin Amazon: Berlin Museum	XXIV	1
Capitoline Amazon: Rome, Capitoline Museum	XXIV	2
Mattei Amazon: Rome, Vatican Museum	XXIV	3
Charioteer, frieze, Maussoleion: London, British Museum	XXV	1
Nike, Athena-Nike temple balustrade: Athens, Akropolis Museum	XXV	2
Satyr ("Marble Faun"): Rome, Capitoline Museum	XXVI	1
"Sauroktonos": Rome, Vatican Museum	XXVI	2
"Sauroktonos": Paris, Louvre Museum	XXVII	1
Satyr (torso): Paris, Louvre Museum	XXVII	2
Satyr (tail preserved): Rome, Vatican Museum	XXVII	3
"Sauroktonos": Dresden, Albertinum	XXVII	4
Hermes of Praxiteles: Olympia Museum	XXVIII	1
Aphrodite, after Praxiteles (from cast, with tin removed; B. A., 371)	XXVIII	2
Hermes of Praxiteles (side view): Olympia Museum	XXIX	1
Aphrodite, after Praxiteles (with tin garment): Rome, Vatican Museum	XXIX	2
Apoxyomenos, after Lysippos (side view): Rome, Vatican Museum	XXIX	3
Harvard Meleager: Cambridge, Mass., Fogg Museum, Harvard University	XXX	1
Meleager: Rome, Vatican Museum	XXX	2
Niobe and daughter: Florence, Uffizi Gallery	XXXI	1
Easy drapery, column from Ephesos: London, British Museum	XXXI	2
Nike of Samothrace (side view)	XXXI	3
Amazons, frieze (Maussoleion): London, British Museum	XXXII	1
Amazons, frieze (Maussoleion): London, British Museum	XXXII	2
Alexander Sarcophagus: Constantinople, Ottoman Museum	XXXIII	1
Lycean Sarcophagus: Constantinople, Ottoman Museum	XXXIII	2

Heads from Alexander Sarcophagus: Constantinople, Ottoman

Museum	XXXIV	1-3
Aphrodite of Melos (front view): Paris, Louvre Museum . .	XXXV	1
Aphrodite of Arles: Paris, Louvre Museum	XXXV	2
Aphrodite of Capua: Naples Museum	XXXV	3
Nike of Brescia: Brescia, Museo Patrio	XXXV	4
Belvedere Apollo: Rome, Vatican Museum	XXXVI	1
Artemis of Versailles: Paris, Louvre Museum	XXXVI	2
Laokoön group: Rome, Vatican Museum	XXXVII	1
Goddess on horseback, Pergamon altar: Berlin, Pergamon Museum	XXXVII	2
Laokoön (head): Rome, Vatican Museum	XXXVIII	1
Zeus Otricoli (bust): Rome, Vatican Museum	XXXVIII	2
Zeus, Pergamon altar: Berlin, Pergamon Museum	XXXVIII	3
Amazon: Naples Museum	XXXVIII	4
Knidian Aphrodite, Kaufmann head (front view): Berlin, private collection (B. A., 161)	XXXIX	1
Weber head (Comte Laborde head): Paris, private collection .	XXXIX	2
Head from south slope of Akropolis: Athens, National Museum (B. A., 174 a)	XXXIX	3
Head from Pergamon: Berlin, Pergamon Museum (B. A., 159)	XXXIX	4
Son of Niobe: Florence, Uffizi Gallery (B. A., 315)	XL	1
Themis of Rhamnos: Athens, National Museum (B.A., 476) .	XL	2
Knidian Aphrodite, Kaufmann head (profile): Berlin, private collection (B. A., 161)	XL	3
Giustiniani "Hestia": Rome, Torlonia Museum (B. A., 491) .	XL	4



INTRODUCTION

The study of Greek sculpture was unknown one hundred and fifty years ago. Winckelmann was the first to pay attention to it, and to publish a book on the subject in 1755. The excavations in Pompeii and Herculaneum, the removal of the Parthenon sculptures to London by Lord Elgin, and above all, the regeneration of Greece and the subsequent rich finds in her soil, added zest to the continually growing interest in this new study.

In the eighteenth century people were unable to judge of ancient art properly because they possessed few originals and were obliged to look through the spectacles of a later Roman civilization.

The scientific nineteenth century probed deeper. The spade of the excavator brought long-forgotten treasures to light; scholars trained in the severe school of philology arranged and classified the material, and little or nothing was left to the art critic. The subject, on the whole, was in the hands of the scientific archæologists, who presented it in more or less exhaustive histories of Greek sculpture or Greek art. All their books follow the historic development. They are histories of ancient artists.

Such a treatment of the subject, although it brought order out of the chaos of the preceding century, made a clear understanding of the spirit of Greek sculpture impossible; for it overburdened the books with such facts as are interesting only to the specialist for use in further discoveries, and cannot legitimately appeal to the artistic public. The archæological discussions, therefore, largely account for the present neglect of ancient art on the part of artists and intelligent laymen.

The eighteenth-century writers tried to generalize without having sufficient facts at their disposal; the nineteenth-century scholars collected the facts, and it therefore becomes our duty in the twentieth century to present the lessons which can be learned from them and to introduce the reader to the spirit and the principles of Greek sculpture.

GREEK SCULPTURE

PART ONE

CHAPTER I


FUNDAMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The spirit of Greek sculpture is synonymous with the spirit of sculpture. It is simple, and therefore defies definitions. We may feel it, but we cannot express it. The reason it has lost its power to-day is that we have listened to what has been said about it instead of coming in contact with it. No amount of book knowledge makes up for the lack of familiarity with original pieces of sculpture. "Open your eyes, study the statues, look, think, and look again," is the precept to all who would learn to know Greek sculpture.

Some introductory helps and guides, to be sure, are not to be despised: they clear one's mind of prevailing misconceptions. Suggestions in this direction, however, often do more than exhaustive discussions, for they stimulate individual thought.

RAPIDITY OF GROWTH

Greek sculpture was of remarkably rapid growth, developing under conditions which are not generally believed to be favorable. Few countries ever underwent such rapid changes as Greece, for the suddenness with which the Mycenæan civilization was swept away, perhaps by the Dorians, is unequaled in history. The three or four centuries following upon the Dorian invasion (about 1000 B.C.)—the dark middle ages of Greece—were full of violent political upheavals; and the whole of the historic period of Greece was characterized by unsettled conditions. States rose and fell with startling rapidity. Athens was an insignificant community before the time of Peisistratos, and is hardly mentioned in the Homeric poems (about 800 B.C.). Her ascendancy dates from the Persian wars (490–480 B.C.), but before the century closed, her glory was over. Alexander the Great came to the throne in 336 B.C.; he carried his standards to India, and when he died Macedonia was destined no longer to be a world power. Pergamon came into prominence in 241 B.C. under Attalos I, and disappeared from among the powers of the earth in 133 B.C. America is spoken of as a new country, but it is almost as old as Greece was when she was absorbed by Rome; and more years have elapsed since the American Declaration of Independence than intervened between the rise and fall of Athens.



PERIKLES
(British Museum)



THE TRIUMPH OF THE FEW

Peace and leisure are commonly believed to be the prerequisites for a period of great art. They surely are, but they must not be understood to refer to external conditions only. It is not the surroundings of the people that tell, but their state of mind; nor is it necessary that all share the blessing of a noble character. The fervor of the few has often achieved the triumphs of a nation. It is a mistake to credit all the Athenians, or even the majority of them, with an artist's love of the beautiful. The petty, unjust middle-class man, as he appears in Aristophanes's comedies and in Plato's dialogues, with his narrow horizon and jealous prejudices, does not explain the sudden rise of Athens, though he may, and probably does, account for her rapid fall. It was in spite of him and his fellows that Athens gained her superiority.

In the field of art, therefore, the importance of the individual artists cannot be overestimated. Sir Robert Ball is on record as saying that scientific discoveries follow the law of necessity, though they may be hastened by the presence of big men. If Watt had not discovered the power of steam, some one else would have done it; and several men were ready to announce to the world Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest. "But," Sir Robert added, "what would the world of music be, if Beethoven had not lived?" What is true

of music is true also of sculpture, or of any of the thought-expressing fine arts. Some of the noblest Greek statues would never have been created if Pheidias had not lived. "Dost thou not know," exclaims an ancient writer, "that there is a Praxitelean head in every stone?" But, it may be added, it takes a Praxiteles to bring it out. Only after the confusing mass of encasing rock has been hewn away does the head reveal its meaning. Most of us, to understand a thought, need its expression. The reality of the thought, however, cannot be denied even when no expression has been vouchsafed it, for it is independent of our conception of it.

SMALL RANGE OF SIMPLE IDEAS

The realm of thoughts expressed in Greek sculpture was circumscribed and far removed from the complexity of modern times. A few simple ideas well expressed form the charm of Greek art. Adequacy of expression, indeed, has at times been considered an essential part of Greek art; and many have spoken of Shelley, Keats, Hölderlin, and others, as Greek, not because these men thought as the ancients did but because they knew how to express their feelings adequately. They were Greek, however, only in part, for they lacked the second quality of ancient art, — simplicity. True simplicity with human beings is rarely spontaneous. The beauty of the Parthenon was the result of much clear thinking

and right feeling. It was, therefore, understood by all, and had become in the very year of its completion, as Plutarch says, a classic.

THE APPEAL OF A WORK OF ART

The power to appeal to all classes of men is given to but few artists, for it requires not only great skill but also a sympathetic knowledge of human nature. This fact is often overlooked. People forget that the appeal of a work of art is directed to the higher faculties of man but that it is made through his eyes. Few things are seen just as they are. The house that we think we see is very different from the pyramidal image of the house that appears on the retina of our eye. The only reason why we are not misled is that we are thoroughly familiar with the house. No such familiarity can be supposed to exist with the work of art. The discrepancy between the imagined object and its realistic representation must be taken into consideration and allowances be made for the peculiarities of human vision. The artist is not permitted to forget that in order to convey his thoughts he borrows shapes from *objective* nature, and that he makes his appeal to human, that is *subjective* nature. He will select of all possible subjects only those that are readily understood, and carve them in a way that is calculated to meet the requirements of the human power of perception. The moral and intellectual development

of a race, therefore, requires changes in the selection of suitable subjects and also in the mode of their representation.

PERIODS OF GREEK SCULPTURE

The Greeks worked along these lines. It is therefore not astonishing that their sculpture can be divided into periods to correspond to the several steps in their civilization. The spirit of their art never changed. Not all sculptors, to be sure, were invariably true to it. However correct their ideas were they could not help giving them an individual interpretation. This makes it necessary to distinguish between what a sculptor meant to do and what he actually did. Just here the archæological treatment of ancient art has erred most. The detail which in the process of creation has detached itself from the whole has been considered by many to be the expression of a new conception. This is a mistake. The Athenian tendencies to over-elaboration, for instance, and the Polykleitean neglect of the nobler side of human nature, are only periodic aberrations. They are entirely outside the even spirit of Greek sculpture, and find their explanation in the passing likes and dislikes of a few men.

Such instances of undue attention paid to one detail or another had, of course, to leave their impress upon subsequent art manifestations. Their influence, however, would have been vastly greater if they had been


the intentional introduction of a new conception, and not merely the accidental exaggeration of a minor part. It is well worth noticing that the overgreat delicacy of early Athenian sculpture is followed by Pheidias; and that Polykleitos, with his disregard of man's noblest side, is immediately superseded by Praxiteles and Skopas, who were the greatest masters in the expression of the passions of the human soul.

CHAPTER II

GREEK SCULPTURE IN ITS RELATION TO NATURE: THE MENTAL IMAGE

Greek sculpture exhibits a quality which is strongly opposed to what is termed realism. Since realism and idealism are opposites, Greek sculpture often has been called idealistic. The realist in art endeavors to represent nature as she really is with all her accidentals and incidentals, and is often so far carried away by these minor quantities that he is unable to catch the true, though fleeting, essence of the object. The idealist consciously disregards the apparent details, spending his efforts in emphasizing the idea which he finds embodied in the object selected for representation. Both men work from the visible objects of nature, which they try to reproduce. Not so the Greeks.

Every one has what may be styled a mental image or a memory picture of his familiar surroundings. To represent these mental images accurately was the aim of the Greeks. They endeavored to make real their ideas, and are therefore rather realists than idealists. But since both these terms at the present time are applied to the definite classes of people mentioned above, it is confusing to use them in speaking of the



SOPHOKLES
(Lateran)



ancient Greeks. This is also true of the modern use of the word "elimination," by which most writers mean "an *intentional* omission or suppression of details." The absence of unnecessary details in Greek sculpture was not due to conscious eclecticism, but to the fact that such details have no place in one's mental images.

The mental image or the memory picture is the impression left upon one after seeing a great many objects of the same type. It is in the nature of the Platonic idea, purified and freed from all individual or accidental ingredients. At times it may even be strangely at variance with a particular object of the class to which it belongs. The human memory is a peculiarly uncertain faculty, and in its primitive stage, though quick to respond, very inaccurate. The shape of a square sheet of paper is readily remembered, and so is a pencil or any other uniform and simple object. Our mental image of an animal is less distinct. We remember the head and the legs and the tail, and perhaps the body, if it is a prominent part, as in the case of a dog or a horse; but all these parts are *unconnected*, and if a child, for instance, is asked to draw a man, he will remember the head and arms and legs, but will not know how to join them together. His mental image of the man as a whole is too indistinct to guide him. In nature the several parts are united in easily flowing curves — they *grow* together; in our mental image they are simply *put* together.

This process of putting together is entirely unconscious, causing us little concern unless we are compelled to reproduce it on paper or in stone, and are forced to compare it with the actual objects about us. Professor Löwy cites a remarkable instance of a perverse mental image on the part of the crude Brazilian draughtsmen, who were much impressed by the mustaches of the Europeans and represented them as growing on the foreheads instead of on the upper lips. In the mental image the upper lip is very unimportant, while the broad stretch of the forehead fills a more prominent place. It is on the forehead, therefore, that the moustache is introduced, in spite of the fact that this is contrary to nature and could daily be proved wrong by even the hastiest glance.

It is not necessary, however, to go so far afield in order to realize the peculiar pranks of mental images. Let the reader call to mind pictures of horses, dogs, flies, lizards, and the like. Horses and dogs he will see in profile; lizards and flies from above. If he is shown one of the recent posters of racing horses from above, such a view does not at once agree with his memory image, and requires a special mental effort to be understood, however accurate it may be. The same is true of the picture of a fly in profile or, perhaps, a dog seen from the front. Neither of these pictures immediately conveys to him the idea of the animal represented, though it probably is more like this

particular view of the animal than his own distorted mental image.

On general principles our mental images of familiar objects ought to be the more distinct. This is, however, not always the case. When we see an animal for the first time we carefully observe it; with every succeeding time we give it less attention, and by and by the most cursory glance satisfies us. The ultimate result of such a procedure is that we carry away with us a mental image the haziness of which in details corresponds to the lack of attention which we finally bestow upon it. Expressed in drawing it will be much further removed from the actual semblance of the animal than another mental image which is penned before the creature has become too familiar to cease to be the interesting object of curiosity. When a primitive draughtsman sketches a wild beast he is apt to show much more individuality than when he is representing his own kind. The features of the Egyptians on old Egyptian wall paintings and reliefs are distinctly less characteristic than those of the Keftiu, or Oriental captives, which often are introduced, and both fall far short of the excellence with which animals are represented.

No mental image is ever reproduced on paper or stone as it actually is. The very attention which is bestowed on it in the endeavor to realize it, robs it of much of its spontaneity; and since it is the result

of *unconsciously* observing a great many objects, it will, when consciously expressed, exhibit many gaps and hazy lines of connection, which the artist must fill as best he can.

Another reason why all mental images cannot be accurately reproduced is that the laws of the physical universe to which the objects belong have no binding force in the psychical world of mental images. Löwy cites as an instance of this the fact that the memory picture of a man in profile may, and with primitive people does, contain two eyes. You cannot, however, draw them both in your picture because of the limitation of space, and are therefore compelled to deviate from your mental image.

Such instances compel the primitive artist to turn to nature for information. This he can do in two ways, —either by observing more thoughtfully, and thus gaining a clearer mental image, or by actually copying the missing parts from a model. The latter way, natural though it may seem, is not so readily resorted to as the first, probably because it would introduce an entirely different quality into the work, —the individual instead of the type. It is, moreover, a well-known fact that children gifted with the pencil and clever at drawing are often utterly unable to make an intelligible copy of a definite model.

The artist under primitive conditions is the exponent of the general tendencies of his people. When he for

the first time expresses his and their mental images, such copies serve a definite end in the development of the race. If the race is sincere and imbued with a craving after truth, the accuracy or inaccuracy of these embodied mental images will be checked by more or less unconscious comparisons with all the many objects of nature, and the result will be a readjustment of the first naturally incorrect mental images. The new ideas will again be expressed by some subsequent artist, and the process of readjustment and renewed expression be repeated. This was the case with the Greeks. The period of historic Greek art was short, but it was long enough to enable the Greeks to advance to the point where mental images of objects suitable for representation in sculpture are so delicate that expressing them is almost identical with copying nature.

The development in Greece was diametrically opposed to what took place, for instance, in Egypt or Assyria. The earliest art expressions in these countries were far ahead of the crude attempts of the Greeks. But instead of using them for the clarification of memory conceptions the mental lethargy of the people rested satisfied with them, and subsequent generations were content to look upon them as binding prototypes. Egyptian or Assyrian statuary in later times can never again be said to be the genuine expression of the ideals of the people. We may take a Greek statue and learn

from it the moral and intellectual attitude of the Greeks at the time when it was made; but we cannot do the same with an Egyptian or Assyrian relief,—at least not to the same extent. This is also largely true of sculpture in modern times. The modern artist has the entire wealth of ancient and Renaissance sculpture at his disposal, and is often willing to copy or adapt their types, making only such alterations as the tastes of his own time imperatively demand. American sculpture, for instance, beautiful as it is in some of its phases, shows a rapid and most remarkable increase in skill, but can hardly be said to reveal the gradual development of the ideals of the people.

It has so far been tacitly assumed that the skill of the artist at every given time enabled him accurately to present his mental images. This was, however, not always the case with the Greeks. Their unusually spirited mental development was such that the technical skill of the artists could not keep step with it, and until toward the autumn days of their art generally fell short of their ideals. Hardly a problem was solved before the growing accuracy of the mental images presented another; and when all the problems of the limited range of subjects which at first were represented had found their solution, new subjects were urgently clamoring for representation. The end of Greek sculpture may be said to have come when all the technical problems had been solved and the mental degeneration

of the race, unwilling to accept the moral and religious views of the new era, had no more worthy ideas to suggest.

Defect and excellence in skill, however, have another influence which cannot be overlooked. Since mental images are the involuntary results of seeing a great many objects and seeing them frequently, they are influenced as well by the numerous statues of men as by *men* themselves. This is especially true of modern times, when the Puritanic disregard for the body has brought about a state of affairs where it is difficult to form intelligent ideas of the human body except from statues and pictures. Nobility of mind and of body often are closely connected, and since the noblest people are hardly to be found among the professional models, the noblest bodies are rarely represented. Some of the coarseness of the nude in modern art is perhaps explained by the fact that the artists are obliged to copy accurately the best models obtainable, instead of being able to form by observation of the noblest bodies their own refined mental images.

The effect of statues upon the mental images of the Greeks was probably less powerful than it is with us, because the Greeks were more familiar with nude bodies, both male and female. They had, however, infinitely more statues, and could not possibly remain entirely uninfluenced by them.

An artist, therefore, in the first place expresses the ideas of his people, and then by so doing influences

them either for the better or the worse. The next artist who endeavors to express the mental images of his contemporaries finds them no longer the primitive product of crude observation of nature, but a combination of the original conceptions and some new ideas. These new ideas are due partly to the impressions received from the first artist's work and partly to the general change that has taken place in the character of the people, owing to their moral and intellectual advance.

The rapid growth of Greek sculpture is undeniable; the primary aim of the artists, however, seems to have been always the same, — to represent well the clearest mental images of the time.

CHAPTER III

THE APPEAL OF GREEK SCULPTURE

It is admitted even by materialists of the most extreme type that a world of bare facts and dry bones is uninteresting and needless. Thoughts that come with the stillness of the evening are realities, and few are the men who in the majestic solitude of a forest are not impressed by greater forces than their eyes can see. Such observations are as true of one's most familiar surroundings as of the rare opportunities in every one's life. Our friends mean more to us than the pleasure we get from looking at them. In fact, we rarely examine them accurately. One glance suffices to tell us they are coming, and after this first announcement through the faculty of eyesight, our enjoyment is almost entirely psychical. This does not, however, exclude the possibility of taking also a distinctly physical pleasure in them, provided the lines of their bodies are such that our eyes glide easily and rhythmically over them. What is true of our friends is true also of less well-known persons and even of strangers. Seeing *them* means a great deal more than seeing a table or a chair, for these latter objects generally suggest nothing beyond what is actually seen. No thoughtful man,

however, can see a *person* without coming—to some extent—in contact with his personality.

A picture also, which may call for admiration on account of its perfect technique, is valuable as a work of art only if it conveys ideas. The outer form of an object appeals to the vision, its spiritual essence to the imagination. The vision is a purely physical faculty; the imagination, a noble acquisition of the human race. The enjoyment through the one is not, however, entirely independent of the other, for the intricacies of human nature are such that it is impossible to say where the one begins and the other ends. The artist, therefore, must consider both, and since his appeal to the imagination is made through the senses, he must studiously avoid all friction with them. This is perfectly in keeping with the experience of great poets, who cannot successfully transmit their thoughts unless they refrain from offending the ear by harsh cadences.

That the Greek sculptors worked along these lines is clear, for many peculiarities of their art find their explanation only if this is understood. The Greeks always had in mind the nobler side of man, but they were well aware of the fact that an impression upon it is impossible unless the physical side of human nature is also gratified. The work of art fails to carry its message if it is not pleasant to look at. To credit the ancients, on the other hand, with a logical interpretation and knowledge of all the principles which they



APOLLO
(West Pediment, Temple of Zeus, Olympia)



followed, is a mistake; the most refined people do the proper things unconsciously.

Modern artistic standards are not uniform; the individuality of the spectator is generally lost sight of in the overpowering individuality of the artist, and the complexity of modern times has so far forced the claims of simple human nature to the background that they are almost forgotten. In antiquity these claims were of great importance. Before attempting, therefore, to judge of the allowances made to them by the Greeks, it is necessary to see what they are.

After the unveiling of commemorative statues it is not unusual to hear comments to the effect that the sculptor had well caught the characteristic pose of the dead, and that the statue looked just like him whom it was intended to commemorate; one could believe one saw the man himself; in short, the statue was a great work of art. The statue may indeed be a great work of art, but not for the reasons mentioned; for most of them are applicable with equal force to any fine figure in the Eden Musée, where wax policemen guard the entrance and waxen smiths are working at the bellows.

Few people, however, would be willing to call such figures great works of art. The average wax figure, while it accurately reproduces the material body of a person, pays no attention to his personality. It is meant for a moment's deception of the vision, and

makes no appeal to a man's higher faculties;—as a suggestive work of art it is unsatisfactory. If a man wants a bodily memento of his friend, he places a statue or a bust of him in his study, and not a wax figure. A good portrait is more satisfactory than a photograph, though the latter is generally a more accurate copy of the material body. Neither the photograph nor the wax figure transmits the spirit of life which primarily represents the man. In art it is the man, with the multiplicity of his thoughts, who is wanted, and not the mechanical reproduction of the lines of his body. The sculptor works in the tangible material of stone or bronze, and the questions arise, Has he any means at his disposal to satisfy the requirements of art? and What are these means?

The first question may unhesitatingly be answered in the affirmative; for the Greek sculptors, and some great men after them, have demonstrated the existence of such means. The second question is less readily answered, because the means are not only different for different subjects, and different according to the several standards of the race, but also so subtle that they can hardly be expressed in words—they must be felt. It is therefore not only impossible, but also perhaps needlessly presumptuous, to enumerate all the means at the disposal of the sculptor,—for who would dare to prescribe to the genius of a great artist? It may be, however, profitable to point out some of the things which the

Greeks avoided in their endeavor to meet the claims of an art that could appeal to human nature.

The practically complete absence of subjects taken from inanimate nature is one of the most noticeable traits of Greek sculpture. The precept therefore has been laid down that sculpture ought to represent nothing but living things. Says Mr. Ruskin: "You must carve nothing but what has life. 'Why?' you probably feel instantly inclined to ask me. 'Must we refuse every pleasant accessory and picturesque detail and petrify nothing but living creatures?'" Even so: I would not assert it on my own authority. It is the Greeks who say it, but whatever they say of sculpture, be assured, is true!" And there he and most teachers of art let the matter rest. But this is neither wise nor just. Unless a man sees the correctness of a precept he ought not to accept it, not even on the authority of the Greeks. Fortunately for us it is not difficult to see why the Greeks avoided inanimate matter in sculpture, for the principle which guided them in this respect is at the very foundation of their art.

Since a work of art may be considered to be non-existent unless it is beheld by human eyes, the danger is ever present of having the spectator's consciousness centered in his purely physical faculty of sight. In order to avoid this the Greeks made use of certain devices or "conventions," by means of which the claims of the vision were satisfied without curtailing the scope

which was given to the higher human faculties of thought or imagination. This was done by reproducing rather the mental image of the object than the object itself. Care was taken, however, that the reproduction should be neither so completely like the original as to challenge, after the first momentary deception, immediate comparison, nor so unlike the original that it should fail to bear strong points of resemblance; for in both these cases the faculty of eyesight would have become disproportionally prominent.

The sculptor, it may be remarked by way of digression, must observe these principles much more carefully than the painter, because painting, which is restricted to two dimensions,—whereas all objects of nature have three,—does not run the danger of deceiving our vision. Sculpture in the round, however, which can exactly represent not only the appearance but also the bodily form of the object, may easily make such a forceful appeal to the vision pure and simple that it fails of attaining its desired end.

In representing inanimate objects in corporeal form the sculptor meets with practically insurmountable obstacles; for, generally speaking, such objects offer no suggestions of thoughts able to appeal to one's nobler self; it is therefore their form pure and simple which is of importance. But since they are represented in full bodily form, even the least deviation from their actual appearance is apt to be noticed—here there is no work

of art because there is no appeal to the imagination. The very excellence, on the other hand, of a truthful representation challenges the vision to make a comparison — again there is no work of art. Only when living people are represented does the indicated character, not the outer form, attract attention. The appeal is not to the vision, but through the vision to the higher mental faculties; for we are, consciously or not, in the habit of reading character in human bodies; and this of course cannot be done by the mere exercise of vision. In viewing, therefore, the statue of a man the faculty of eyesight is less consciously active than that of imagination. The best work of art in fact ceases to be an interesting object of sight altogether, making its appeal immediately to the imagination. Artists at all times have striven to accomplish this. The realistic reproduction of nature never does it; neatness of workmanship alone is useless in this respect. Only those workers achieve it who, like the Greeks, pay full attention to the peculiar needs of physical human nature. In sculpture this is impossible unless living creatures are represented.

The idea of life may be enhanced by means of contrast. The ancients, therefore, admitted lifeless things into their compositions as accessories. The principles which ought to govern the use of such secondary subjects are well set forth by Mr. Ruskin, who says: "Nothing must be represented in sculpture external to any

living form which does not help to enforce or illustrate the conception of life. Both dress and armour may be made to do this and are constantly so used by the greatest, but," Mr. Ruskin adds, using an instance of modern sculpture, though his inferences are equally true of Greek art, "note that even Joan of Arc's armour must be only sculptured, *if she has it on*; it is not the honourableness or beauty of it that are enough, but the direct bearing of it by her body. You might be deeply, even pathetically, interested by looking at a good knight's dented coat of mail, left in his desolate hall. May you sculpture it where it hangs? No; the helmet for his pillow, if you will — no more."

But how may such a helmet be sculptured, or how must the armor be treated if the hero has it on? Shall we represent it as accurately as possible? Suppose we do, and suppose the statue we make is of bronze; then there is absolutely no reason why the result should not be a second armor so much like the one the hero wore that our vision is deceived into seeing the armor itself. But how about the person that wore it? His bronze statue reproduces the sculptor's mental image of his personality — the man it cannot be; the quality of the accessory is different from that of the figure itself. The one is what it appears to be; the other cannot even appear to be what it is meant to represent, because the very contrast between the real armor and the lifeless form of the man awakens the thought that he is

not real. "But," an objector exclaims, "if the armor ought not to be made just like its prototype, the sculptor surely ought not to carve it altogether unlike it." Certainly not; for if he did, the very fact that it was all too little like a coat of mail would at once attract the spectator's attention, and his vision, always on the alert, would be so prominently called into play that the true purpose of the work of art would be lost.

How fully the Greeks appreciated these facts is perhaps best seen in the draperies of their statues, which are always true enough to *appear* real without ever being correct. Nobody has yet been able to demonstrate from the statues the accuracy of his theories on ancient costumes gleaned from the study of literary descriptions and vase paintings. The painters often attained to a fairly accurate rendering of the garment, the sculptors never. They not only took great liberties with those pieces of the drapery which they represented, but even omitted entire garments. The Sophokles, opposite page 8, in the Lateran Museum, for instance, is represented as wearing only the outer costume or overcoat, while it is well known from literature that gentlemen never appeared in public in quite so scanty an attire. The warriors from the pediments of the temple of Aigina, Pl. XII, Fig. 1, with one or two exceptions, are completely nude; they have gone into battle with the helmets on their heads and the shields

on their arms, but without one single piece of drapery. The Greeks never entered battle in this way, either at the time the marbles were carved, or at the time which the statues commemorate, or at any other time. Such a partial or complete omission of the drapery can hardly be explained as the unconscious reproduction of a mental image; while the actual treatment of the drapery, as it appears, for instance, in the Nike of Paionios or on the Parthenon frieze, probably is more or less unconscious. Many modern writers use the word "elimination" in speaking of Greek drapery; but this is a mistake, because elimination implies the *studied* omission of *details*, and cannot, therefore, account either for the omission of *entire* garments or the *unconscious* treatment of actually sculptured costumes.

The eclecticism in Greek drapery may be called one of the devices or "conventions" of Greek sculpture, and may serve to prove that such conventions do not hold good for all times. When Greenough carved his large statue of George Washington in the national Capitol, he omitted the drapery on the upper part of the body, obviously with the intention of drawing the attention of the spectator away from the dress to the person who wore it. He clearly followed in this respect the practices of the Greeks, and more especially the pattern set by Pheidias in his colossal Zeus in Olympia. The Greeks might omit the drapery with impunity, for they were as a race intensely fond of the nude. Greenough,

imitating them in the face of very pronounced racial and religious prejudices against the nude, committed the unpardonable mistake of copying not the spirit of a past art but its accidental expression. Instead of accomplishing his end, therefore, by omitting the drapery, he achieved the opposite, for the drapery is "conspicuous by its very absence."

The same considerate spirit which prompted the Greeks to deviate from nature in representing drapery shows itself also in their treatment of rocks, trees, and the like in marble reliefs. Marble is rock, and nothing is easier than to reproduce the rock accurately, so that the result is not only a picture of the rock, but really a second piece of rock. If this had been done, for instance, on the marble base from Mantinea, Pl. I, Fig. 1, the contrast between the actual rock and the representation of Apollo sitting on it would have deprived the god of all semblance of reality. Similar observations may be made with the trees on the frieze of the Athena-Nike temple in Athens, or the stepping-stones on the frieze of the Parthenon.

These instances suffice to show the general attitude of the Greek sculptors toward the public. The public—and of course the artists belong to the public—are not automatic checking machines, but human beings, with all the complexities and inconsistencies that the term implies. They are entitled to consideration, and at the hands of the ancient artists they received it.

What is more, the Greeks gave it gladly; for to make allowances for the frailties of human nature was to them not an irksome duty but a welcome privilege, enabling them to introduce into their art a human element of great variety and of unexhausted possibilities.

CHAPTER IV

THE ARTIST AND HIS PUBLIC


The personal influence of the Greek artists upon their communities was great, although it is not often touched upon in ancient literature. This influence was due to the fact that the artists felt themselves one with the public, and rarely, if ever, believed they were set off as a class by themselves, distinct from the laymen. Such a view, however, has often since prevailed. When Michelangelo carved the tombs of the Medicis and there gave a mystic expression to his ideas of liberty, these thoughts were to him exclusively his own,—too high, too good to be shared by the common populace,—and yet they were the very thoughts in the thinking of which this populace had begun to delight. When the genius of an artist is grappling with the unexpressed phantoms of new ideas, and after patient meditation realizes them on canvas or in stone to the extent of transforming the haziness of the notions into appalling clearness, he may indeed be forgiven if he takes a too exalted view of his achievements and believes that he and his fellow-artists are of nobler timbre than the general public.

Such a view, however, is erroneous and contrary to certain observations which it is in the power of every one to make. It is, for instance, not of rare occurrence to have two men, under widely different conditions and far apart, suddenly find the expression of an apparently original thought at exactly the same time; and it happens even oftener that several people are simultaneously engaged in the solution of identical problems. The thought, then, one might say, is the active force, urgently clamoring for expression; the artists—poet, sculptor, painter, sage—are willing tools. The thoughts themselves, however, are the products of the intellectual life both past and present, and are the common inheritance of the artists and the laymen. It is therefore a mistake to believe that only the man who has the skill of expression is able to enter upon this inheritance; on the contrary he is often the very one who by his neglect of an education and his thoughtless application to manual dexterity forfeits his birthright.

The world of thoughts with which we come in contact to-day is vastly greater than at any other time. In antiquity an Aristotle could without presumption claim to be master of everything, and even in the sixteenth century of our era Scaliger could enjoy a similar reputation; to-day this is out of the question for any one. The thoughts which are the property of the community have multiplied at such a tremendous rate that no one lifetime suffices to grapple with all. Together with this



NIKE OF SAMOTHRACE
(Louvre)



increase in the world of thoughts, the power seems to have been developed in the individual to master them even without their finding visible or audible expressions. Mr. Ruskin once said he could well imagine the time when the human race would have so far advanced that it could realize the noble thoughts, now expressed in art, without the help of art. Humanity has already made a tremendous step in this direction. Religious thoughts in many denominations are independent of pictorial aids. The Roman Church still clings to them, and so does the Lutheran, and to some extent the Protestant Episcopal; but those denominations which owe their origin to more recent centuries have entirely discarded them. No instances taken from religious practices are altogether fair, because too much sentiment is involved and too little unbiased human nature. But, even after due deductions, the progress from the Roman Church, conservatively adhering to the traditions of the past, to the modern Protestant churches is too striking not to serve as an illustration of the fact that the human race has grown in power to realize,—that is, to possess thoughts which are never expressed.

Whatever vistas these considerations may open for the future, it is probably a fact that at the present time no one individual, and certainly not the race as a whole, has attained to the state of mind prophesied by Mr. Ruskin. If this is true of the people to-day, it was infinitely more so of the people in Greece. Their

world of thoughts was remarkably simple; even their philosophers, whose teachings are admired to-day, shared this blessing of comparative simplicity; and the fundamental ideas contained in the great Greek tragedies are far removed from confusing complexity.

The Greek race, according to their own ideas, was autochthonos, — sprung from the soil where they lived, — without a past of more than a few centuries. We know that the Greeks were mistaken, — that back of the dark middle ages of Greece there lay the old civilization of glory and splendor called the Mycenæan Age; and that even the Mycenæan Age was perhaps not the first development in the progress of the race. But what of it! The past was blotted out; the memory of it was gone; and step by step the historic Greeks had to make their advance, apparently unaided, just as if they really had sprung from the soil. No thoughts of their distant ancestors had been recorded, and the few tremendous ruins which the obliterating storms of prehistoric events had been obliged to spare were mistaken for remnants of a foreign race of giants. The more recent discoveries in Mycenæ and on Crete have brought to light objects of art which show a splendidly æsthetic temper and an unusually refined power of enjoyment. It is not impossible that these traits were inherited by the historic Greeks from their distant ancestors, unknown to themselves, and that they thus account, to some degree, for the unparalleled and rapid artistic advance which

took place when the race had again "found itself." But however this may be, every thought expressed, for the time being, was a new thought, and was greeted with that admirable delight which accompanies every fresh achievement.

The wonderful skill of the Greeks, and their great simplicity, which for most of us now is the slow result of painstaking and liberal education, is apt to make one forget that after all the Greeks were a primitive people. Like all primitive people they were constantly trying to realize more fully those thoughts which they possessed; and when a thought had once been embodied, such embodiment, at least at first, stood for nothing but the one definite thought. We cannot now look upon the statue of the god Apollo without immediately seeing in it all the changes which the conception of that deity underwent in subsequent ages, especially under the process of contrasting it with the one God whose religion was destined to supplant the cheerful, and once helpful, trust in the Olympic Pantheon. The extant statues of ancient gods, therefore, are for the modern beholder largely symbolic, whereas for the original Greeks they were expressive of definite thoughts. It was the artists who gave to the mental images or ideas of the people concrete shapes, and they could do so because they themselves were *of* the people.

This explains why the ancient artists are not set off as a class by themselves; for the fact that a man was

gifted with the power of expression did not exempt him from the closest identification with the general public. Some excerpts from later Roman writers may seem to contradict this view, but it must be remembered that the Romans were given to draw sharp class distinctions. The very paucity, therefore, of references pointing toward such differentiation between Greek artists and their public may be used as an argument in favor of the assertion that such division did not exist.

The Greek artists, then, in order to fulfill their calling well had to be wide-awake children of their own time. Every now and then, especially toward the end, we find a harking back to the past, but never to the extent of forgetting the present and its special claims. The Olympian Zeus by Pheidias was unanimously believed to be the most complete realization of a noble thought; many statues were carved under its influence, but not one single instance of slavish imitation is known during the centuries that intervene between its erection in the fifth century B.C. and the end of Greek art.

Not a single one of the best Greek statues probably was meant to represent a thought of which the artist believed himself to be the inventor or sole possessor prior to the completion of his statue. Such a point of view does not in the least detract from the importance of the artist, for he is the first to seize upon this particular aspect of the idea and the only one to give it a visible shape. It is this bodily expression

which enables the multitude of his fellow-men to share with him an accuracy of conception which without his aid would at least be difficult to attain.

Such and similar considerations, based upon what happened or did not happen in antiquity, cannot form altogether sound premises for the discussion of principles which are to govern the relations of modern artists to their public. Present conditions are too different to permit exact parallelisms to be drawn between the ancient and the modern art life. No student of art and life, however, can help being impressed by a certain incongruity. In spite of superior skill our artists as a class do not seem to be altogether successful. The difficulty, however, does not lie so much with them, as artists, as with the public of whom they are a part, whence they draw their knowledge, and, if not actually their inspiration, anyhow the *raison d'être* of their inspiration. The responsible public no longer consists of the well-educated few with an enrapturing family past, but of practically the entire populace. This populace at present forms a heterogeneous, often discordant, whole. Some good men, therefore, imbued with admiration for the noble relics of the past, and, genius-like, unconscious of some of its sordid conditions which the intervening centuries have kindly hidden from view, are sounding the impossible retreat. The march of humanity is onward. We may learn of the spirit which once was successful; but in every case its right

application must be the creation of new conditions in keeping with the new times.

In Greece the sculptors worked for the people of whom they were a part. They knew the peculiarities of their nature, and endeavored to meet their needs. Abstract reasoning and willful perseverance in entirely subjective and therefore often unintelligible nature interpretation they avoided. "As a thing appears to me, so it is," was their motto. But this "me" did not mean the artist as an individual, but the artist as the representative of the people. As such he gladly placed his superior skill and his clearer perceptions at their service. What he carved was not unknown to them, for, if they had done nothing more, they had at least felt the justice of the thoughts which he expressed. It is a great thing to be an individual artist; it is a greater thing to be, like the Greek sculptor, the exponent of the best ideas of his people.

CHAPTER V

THE PRINCIPLES OF GREEK RELIEF SCULPTURE

The thoughtful consideration of the needs of human nature which characterizes the best Greek works is nowhere better seen than in relief sculpture.

All relief sculpture may be divided into two large classes, exhibiting great technical differences. The artist may, in the first place, design and carve his figures on a block of stone of which he hews away as much as he likes in order to bring out the contours. He begins on the *front plane*, beyond which no figure may project, and pays no attention to a uniform depth of background. This kind of relief may be called the *carved relief*.

In the other kind, which originated when the sculptors no longer worked upon the marble itself but made their first designs in clay, the figures are modeled separately and attached to one *uniform* and unifying *background*. A profile view reveals the entire absence of a common front plane. Eventually these models may be carved in marble or be cast in bronze, but owing to their origin, and in order to distinguish them from the other kind, they are best called the *modeled reliefs*.


The best known reliefs in this style, which is very common in the present day, are the Ghiberti gates on the baptistery in Florence. The Greeks practiced almost exclusively the *carved relief*.

In describing a Greek relief people are in the habit of speaking of the figures as *raised* to a certain height from the background. This is obviously inaccurate, because the technique of the carved relief requires their being sunk from the front plane. It is quite possible — and of frequent occurrence on the Parthenon frieze — to have the right side of a figure sunk much deeper than the left side, and the feet deeper than the head. There is then practically no background from which the figures can be said to have been raised. The effect of such a technique is that the figures themselves and *not* the background — which in pictures often is the prominent part — arrest the attention of the spectator.

The human faculty of vision is restless; one feels discomforted if one is obliged to keep a steady focus — that is, if one is compelled to look at the same object for any length of time. In the picture one's imagination may wander from the nearest object to the farthest, and vice versa; in the carved relief, which contains, broadly speaking, only the nearest object, care must be taken to provide variety in another direction. This is the reason why the broad expanse of the Parthenon frieze is so extremely satisfactory. The skill of the artists, by a multitude of clever devices, has made it almost



HORSEMEN (West Frieze, Parthenon)



impossible to look long at any single figure. Hardly has the spectator understood one figure when its lines carry him on to the next and then to the next, first rapidly and then slowly, as he approaches the quiet company of gods seated above the entrance door.

It is not difficult to see that a relief of this kind cannot be well adapted to a panel, limited in size and small enough to fall at once within the radius of distinct vision. All the figures are crowded into the foreground; they are quickly reviewed, and when one's eyes desire a change there is no expanse into a distance the view of which could satisfy. The natural restlessness of one's vision makes one feel this lack, and one is apt to experience a sense of dissatisfaction.

The modeled relief, with its permitted depth of background, has been able to overcome this difficulty to a great extent, and certainly offers possibilities in this direction not possessed by the older style. None of its creations, however, to the present day can be said to have been altogether successful. Great depth of reproduction requires the introduction of perspective; and while linear perspective is not incompatible with corporeal representation, aerial perspective is, because it lessens the distinctness of the contours of those objects which are seen at a distance. Another formidable obstacle is the proper treatment of shadows.

It may be safely assumed that the ancients were aware of these difficulties, and therefore somewhat

tenacious in their adherence to the practices of the older style, at least in their more pretentious works of art. In minor works, notably in terra cottas, they pushed the tentative beginnings in the other style to a considerable extent. Nothing, however, will do more to clarify the views on Greek relief sculpture than to treat of the two styles separately; and since the second style occurs in ancient times only in works of secondary importance, it is best to confine oneself to the *carved* relief.

The Greeks had no distinguishing words for high or low relief. To-day people find that not even these two words are sufficient to designate the different methods of relief work. They speak of high relief or alto-relievo, mezzo-relievo, low relief or basso-relievo, stacciato, and finally have to coin a new word to describe a method practiced by the ancient Egyptians. The very fact that only "high relief" and "low relief" are idiomatic English terms goes far to show that these are the most popular reliefs in use at the present date. The same was true of the Greeks.

The names themselves, however, characterize the reliefs only to a certain extent, for whereas the Parthenon frieze with an average depth of from two to three inches and an extent of five hundred and twenty-three feet is called low, a small panel exhibiting the same depth is apt to be called by most people high

relief. The terms "high" and "low," therefore, are only relatively descriptive. The real differences lie in the technique and in the design, and these are absolute. The Greeks, moreover, did not use high or low relief indiscriminately as the individual taste of the artist or the art patron demanded; for the selection of the particular method to be employed depended upon external circumstances, such as lighting, height, and so forth.

If a very flat relief is placed in a well-lighted room it appears indistinct; as the curtains are lowered it seems to grow out from the background, until in the proper dim light it fairly approximates the lines of a high relief. This is the reason why the Greeks had no distinguishing names for the two kinds of relief. They were not intended as different practices; on the contrary, the impression made upon the spectator by the one was to be approximately the same as that made by the other. The Greeks knew the importance of light and shadow: they knew that the same work under different conditions *appears*, and therefore to all practical purposes *is*, a different work of art; and that, on the other hand, two reliefs of entirely different technique may be seen as much alike if they are placed under proportionally different conditions. In other words, the work of art must be designed for the particular condition under which it is to be seen.

That this was the practice of the Greeks is attested to by a story current in antiquity, according to which

Pheidias and his famous pupil Alkamenes once entered a competition in which the latter came near winning the prize because the master's statue, at short range, did not seem to exhibit the same pleasing proportions as that of his pupil. The statues were designed for high positions, and not until they had been so placed was it seen that Pheidias had carved an infinitely better statue than his pupil. The story, though perhaps a spurious anecdote of later times, invented to illustrate the practice of Pheidias, does palpable injustice to Alkamenes, who probably was one of the greatest artists of the fifth century. The statues of Pheidias were not the only ones that were designed for the particular conditions under which they were to be seen, for the same can be said of all the best Greek works, and not to the least degree of the Parthenon sculptures. That these latter are splendid even now, when they are taken from their exalted position, is an additional proof of their exquisite simplicity and delicate workmanship. No student of Greek art, however, will deny that the Parthenon reliefs and pedimental sculptures would appear to even better advantage if they could be restored to their proper places and be viewed in their right light.

The Ionic frieze, with its comparatively low reliefs, was placed around the cella walls on the inside of the colonnade, where the direct rays of light never could strike it; while the Doric frieze, broken up in the triglyphs and metopes with powerful figures in the

highest possible relief, was attached to the outside above the columns. Here it commanded the maximum of light, which in its Athenian intensity of brightness is unknown in the western and more northerly climes.

This may at first seem strange, for most people reason that the dim and uncertain light of a half-interior requires very prominent figures to have them at all seen. This, however, is a mistake, as experiments can teach. The more prominently a figure stands out from the background, the deeper its shadow is. Whatever figure happens to be in this shadow disappears from view in an interior; for the light, which is dim anyhow, is converted into darkness by the addition of the shadow. Shadows are so much darkness; removed they add that much light to the composition.

The suppression of the shadows may, theoretically, seem to run so decidedly counter to nature that the result must be unsatisfactory. This is, however, not the case, for shadows are often all but unnoticed, especially on gloomy days; and even under bright light their absence is rarely felt, provided there is uniformity in their absence. This is best seen on the stage, where shadows are artificially removed by throwing extremely strong side lights on the actors. On the stage the absence of shadows is often a necessity, for the background is painted in perspective. A painted house, for instance, which is actually only ten feet back

of the actor, is nevertheless imagined to be hundreds of feet away. If the shadows of the actor were to fall on the house top, the illusion would be destroyed. For this reason shadows on the stage are avoided; and this is done without giving the spectators the least unpleasant sensation. The suppression of shadows on a relief, therefore, need not occasion any apprehension. Experience, moreover, teaches that it passes unnoticed if judiciously and uniformly employed.

These considerations may prove that a very high relief is not suited for a position in dim light. Any doubts as to the advisability of placing a very low relief there are successfully scattered by making the experiment mentioned above. It will be seen that the relief must be low in proportion to the dimness of the room; for the lack of proper light makes it necessary for the composition to supply its own light, as it were, which is successfully done by the more or less vigorous suppression of shadows. The lowest relief, with practically no shadows, belongs to the darkest room. No figure is obscured by its neighbor; all are equally well seen. The absence of shadows, therefore, has added so much light to the composition.

Low relief supplements the absence of strong light, whereas high relief, by its vigorous shadows, tones down the brightness of too much light. And thus the very qualities of these two kinds of relief equalize the differences in the amount of light under which they are seen.

Their impressions upon the spectators, consequently, are more alike than could be expected from an analytical study of them when they are removed from their proper places and put side by side for inspection under the same strong light.

CHAPTER VI


THE DIFFERENT TECHNIQUE OF HIGH AND LOW RELIEF SCULPTURE

HIGH RELIEF

The impressions of high reliefs and low reliefs in their proper places may be similar; their technique, however, is very different. The technique of high relief is by far the simpler. The bulk of the figures, in so far as they are detached from the background, is almost the same as in nature. And if the figures are below life size, their bulk—that is, their thickness—can be proportionately reduced; for, as Sir Charles Eastlake says, “The eye agrees as readily to the reduction in bulk as to the reduction in size.” The very prominence of the forms and their necessarily deep shadows require a simple composition. The figures must be designed so that they do not obscure the contours of each other, and so that they stand out clearly, each one by itself. To accomplish this result they are carved in *open action*. The action of a figure is open when the two halves of the body are kept separate,—the right arm and leg on one side, the left arm and leg on the other. In violent movement the arm or the leg of one side is apt to sweep over to the other side, which gives *contrasted action*.



AMAZONS
(Frieze of Mausoleion, British Museum)



If this was represented in high relief, the prominent shadow of the limb crossing the body would tend to obscure the outlines of the figure. Nothing, however, is of greater importance either in the art of painting or of carving than to keep the outlines pure. This does not at all mean that one must *see* every single line, for the lines which are suggested are fully as important as those which are seen. The Greeks knew this, as is proved by the practice of their early vase painters, who before painting draped figures drew them nude. None of the lines of the drapery were to suggest faulty contours below. Great care, therefore, has to be taken not to introduce into a composition any element that would suggest wrong lines, and no other element is so apt to do this in sculpture as the shadow of actual members crossing the body. This is the chief reason why contrasted action is to be avoided in high relief. As a matter of fact it does not once occur on any of the preserved metopes of the Parthenon.

An inevitable result of this restriction upon high relief is that figures from such compositions will rarely form suitable subjects for copies or adaptations in the round. There are exceptions,—perhaps the Aphrodite of Melos. Figures in the round, on the other hand, have occasionally been adapted for transposition in a high relief. On one of the metopes of the Parthenon the artist has made use of the Harmodios of the Tyrannicide group which was first designed by Antenor

(ca. 510 B.C.) and then probably copied by Kritios and Nesiotes (ca. 479 B.C.). The figure belongs to a very early period of Greek art, when contrasted action had hardly begun to be used even for figures in the round.

The requirements for high relief, then, are a very simple composition with open action both for individual figures and for entire groups. Shadows supply variety and save the composition from monotony, which would be its fate if it were executed in low relief.

LOW RELIEF

Low relief offers the proper field for complicated groups and lively figures in contrasted action. Since confusing shadows are uniformly and almost completely absent, it is possible to represent rows of men two, three, four, or even more deep. Such a representation in high relief would be an anomaly. The nearest figures would show the highest projection, and the farther ones be represented in gradually diminishing bulk. The shadows cast would be different, and their lack of uniformity would reveal the unreality of the composition, not to speak of the confusion and obscurity which must accompany such a design in high relief. In low relief one does not run this danger, because all the shadows are equally suppressed.

Near the northwest corner of the Parthenon frieze a young man is represented as standing in front of his horse, page 38. The horse is seen in profile, the man in

full front with his back to the flank of his horse. If one steps up close to the frieze and looks at it under strong light, one sees that what really is carved is a young man in the middle, front to, with the hind quarters of a horse on his left side, and its head and fore legs on his right, all carved on the same plane. At a distance and under its proper light the original illusion again returns,—one sees a man standing in front of his horse. The explanation of this phenomenon is found in the uncertainty of human vision. Seeing really means projecting everything upon one definite plane. The distances of the several objects thus promiscuously projected upon one common background, or drawn up to one front plane, are *guessed* at—for it really is nothing but guesswork—with reference to three chief and largely unconscious considerations: first, their relative size and distinctness; second, their shadows; and finally, one's own general knowledge of the fitness of things. The distances represented on the Parthenon frieze are not large enough to necessitate any marked differences in size and distinctness, especially when different species are drawn,—as a man and a horse on this slab. The shadows are suppressed, it being low relief. One has therefore to rely upon one's sense of fitness. A man in front of a horse is frequently seen; a man grafted in between the two halves of a horse, never. The second possibility, therefore, which the general lines of the composition admit, does not occur to one's mind.

And since there are no confusing contours or disturbing shadows to contradict the first idea, the spectator does not hesitate to read it into the composition, although it is the second one which really is carved.

To speak of the complete suppression of shadows in low relief is not entirely correct, for even the lowest figures throw some shadows, although the introduction of curving contours may render them all but imperceptible to the human eye. On the Parthenon frieze the artists have at times used such slight shadows very successfully to strengthen the intended illusion and to guard against possible detection. The outlines of the man on the slab under consideration are relieved against the horse. In order to do this the body of the horse is not carved in one horizontal plane, but curves away very gradually alike from the head and the tail to the background in the center. These curves are so gradual that they escape notice except in close proximity. They nevertheless enabled the sculptors to give sharp outlines to the man, strengthening by means of the shadows which his body seems to throw on his animal the impression that he is standing in front of his horse.

In the same way the horse's head appears to be removed from the spectator by at least the thickness of the man's body. In reality, however, it is carved on the same front plane as he. This shows that in low relief *farther objects need not be carved on more distant planes*. The front, even in low relief, is the most prominent part

of the composition. The artist may therefore pick out those details to which he wants to call special attention and carve them on this plane, provided he manages their contours so that not even the slightest shadows contradict the illusion. This device is a favorite one with the Parthenon sculptors. Iris, Pl. I, Fig. 2, the messenger of the gods, is thought of as standing back of Hera on the east frieze. The lower half of her figure is carved on a distant plane. The upper half, which could not be seen if it were carved there, because at the height of thirty-nine feet the projecting lower limbs of Hera would have hidden it, curves forward to the front plane, on which her breast, head, and shoulders are represented. The result is as pleasing as it would have been painful if the drapery on Hera's lap had shut Iris from view.

Many such and similar devices or *conventions* are at the disposal of the sculptor of low relief. In the absence of prominent shadows and great distances he takes the spectator at his weakest point—his uncertain vision—and works an illusion wherever he can.

The facility with which such an illusion is wrought is a dangerous boon for the artist. He carves one thing and wants the spectator to see another. If he actually represents his figures bulk for bulk, as in the round, or largely in high relief, there is little danger of having any one imagine he saw anything but what was actually represented; but when the sculptor makes use

of *conventions*, and does not truthfully represent his figures, then the spectator is at liberty to pick out any possibility that may offer itself. This compels the artist to design his composition so that its lines cannot be interpreted in more than one definite way. The Parthenon sculptors have done this, and of the many hundreds of figures on the frieze not a single one can be misunderstood, although not one is carved as it is meant to be seen.

The figures are good because they *appear* correct, and they appear so because the artists who carved them knew how to reconcile the claims of objective and of subjective nature. The means by which this is done are nowhere less disguised than in reliefs, which is the reason why the study of these reliefs is of the greatest importance for the student of ancient art.

CHAPTER VII

GREEK RELIEF SCULPTURE IN ITS RELATION TO ARCHITECTURE; RELIEFS ON ROUNDED SURFACES

The relation of Greek relief sculpture to architecture is of the closest. In the Parthenon frieze the artists never forgot that their figures were seen as carved on the temple walls. Moving figures are readily imagined as passing by a solid wall; trees or other indications of landscape are out of place. A few large stepping-stones, (West Frieze, page 60), which in the absence of stirrups in ancient times were used to mount on horseback, are introduced, but they do not disturb the uniformity of the conception. The close adherence to such limitations of design imposes great restrictions upon the sculptors; for while they must refrain from filling occasional gaps with trees, houses, and the like, they must also design the very ground upon which the figures move as perfectly plane. No unevenness of territory can be permitted to bring variety into the grouping; whatever variety there is must be given by the figures themselves.


The sculptors of the Parthenon seem to have accepted these laws as binding principles. Once or twice,

however, even they have deviated from a strict adherence to them. On the southern frieze, in front of the cavalcade and ahead of the chariots, is the slow procession of men bringing cows and sheep to the sacrifice. Men and chariots proceed at full speed; cows naturally walk slowly. The difference in rapidity between these two integral parts of the pageant would have been noticeable, and probably painful in its effect, if easy transitions had been lacking. The second cow, Pl. II, Fig. 1, therefore, is represented as bolting. She has almost broken away from the man who is holding her by a rope. He has thrown the entire weight of his body against her, but is irresistibly swept along, when suddenly his right foot strikes a boulder in the road, against which he can brace himself. The headway of the cow is broken: the next minute she will be under control. The bracing attitude of the youth is splendid, — human skill matched against brute force and victorious over it! Without the slight unevenness of the ground such a figure would have been impossible. The entire group is so full of life that one forgets the device of the artist.

A similar instance occurs on the west frieze, but such deviations from strict principles on the Parthenon are rare. They occur with increasing frequency in the later buildings, where the copious representations of battle scenes offered unusual temptations. No Greek battle scene is complete without numerous dead or wounded



BATTLE SCENE, THESEION FRIEZE (Athens)
From Brunn-Arndt, Pl. 407



on the ground. When the ground is flat the comparative similarity of all these figures becomes monotonous. Reclining figures, moreover, which are flat on their backs on a horizontal plane appear out of proportion if accurately represented, because human eyes move on horizontal and on vertical lines with unequal rapidity. The Greeks obviously felt this, although it was left to modern experimental psychology to explain it.

The conscious, or perhaps unconscious, desire of the Greeks to comply with this law of nature made them at first carve the dead in contorted positions; for instance, on one of the metopes of the Parthenon, Pl. XXI, Fig. 2, where a victorious centaur is swinging his panther skin in exultant glee over the dead Greek. Later, in the endeavor to avoid similar awkward positions, they resorted to the introduction of an uneven ground in their temple reliefs. On the poorly preserved but splendid frieze of the little Athena-Nike temple in Athens, Pl. II, Fig. 3, some of the most pleasing lines are seen in the conquered warriors who in death have fallen over the slight hillocks which break the dead level of the ground.

The frieze was designed to encircle the outside of the low temple. The figures, therefore, which could be seen at rather close range and under strong light, had to stand out in fairly bold relief. They are not undercut, but they throw, nevertheless, noticeable shadows, and are therefore designed in fairly open action.

Since the frieze is Ionic, continuous, and not broken up in triglyphs and metopes, as the Doric frieze on the outside of the Parthenon, the strict adherence to the principles of high relief would have resulted in occasional spaces of absolute emptiness between the figures. It was this fact that led to a further deviation from the laws observed in the Parthenon; for the gaps could not always be filled with fluttering folds of drapery, such folds at times being contradictory to the action of the figures. In such cases the well-known Greek *horror vacui* tempted the sculptors to introduce trees. These, however, were treated with so much delicacy that they cannot be said to interfere with the uniform enjoyment of the composition.

The inevitable result of such moderate deviations from a law which at one time must have seemed to the Greeks to be irrefragable, was the gradual introduction of other and less judicious practices. Two of the most important instances of this kind are found on the Athena-Nike temple frieze. Several warriors, Pl. II, Fig. 3, are represented with their backs to the spectator, a design which under ordinary conditions would compel one to think of them as actually pressed against the background. They are, nevertheless, shown in violent motion and with sufficient freedom of action to continue a vigorous fight. Other warriors again are coming slantingly out from the background. In both instances, therefore, one is expected to imagine the figures

somewhat in front of the temple; there is space, air, between them and the wall. It matters little that on the whole the wall still continues to be the background of the composition; the important fact is that in several cases air has been substituted. The relief no longer is an integral part of the architectural structure.

RELIEFS ON ROUNDED SURFACES

Most of the Greek reliefs were placed on straight surfaces; but when cups or other rounded objects were decorated, a new technique was required. Low relief, with its many devices intended for the production of an illusion, was obviously out of the question because of the proximity and the strong light under which these objects could be seen, and high relief was equally inadmissible since its prominent figures would have destroyed the proper profile of the rounded surfaces. The ancients therefore resorted to another kind of relief, in which all the figures were equally detached from the surface to about half of their thickness. This relief is called *mezzo-relievo*. Several marble vases of a later day are extant in this style, which, however, did not attain to great popularity in classic times. If the Greeks had followed the practices of the Egyptians, who decorated their columns with sculptured figures instead of simply fluting them, as was done in Greece, the case probably would have been different.

EGYPTIAN *ISLAND* RELIEF

The discussion of Egyptian practices does not generally throw much light upon Greek sculpture; in this particular case, however, it is rather suggestive. Since the Egyptian columns were often seen in strong light, low relief was inadmissible. High relief, on the other hand, would have spoiled, as in the case of the Greek cups, the architectural profile of the columns. The use of the possible mezzo-relievo too would have meant a great waste of material and of labor; for supposing the height of the reliefs to have been only three inches, this would still have meant an additional thickness of six inches to the diameter of the column, all of which again had to be neatly cut away everywhere except where the figures were represented. The Egyptians found a way out of this difficulty, which is the more surprising as it implies an acute observation of the frailty of human vision. They drew the outlines of the figures on the columns and surrounded them by a deep groove. Inside of this groove they applied as much modeling as they deemed necessary. The figures, being thus surrounded by a channel of considerable depth, were completely isolated. This style of relief sculpture, therefore, may properly be called the *island relief*. Its aims, like those of low relief, are to create an illusion. If one steps away from it to the proper distance, one does not see the figure as it actually is,

sunk into the column, but prominently standing out from it. This is due to the fact that the grooved outline of the figure nearest the light shows a deep shadow, while its opposite side is fully lighted. A similarly strong contrast between the two sides of a figure is noted in high relief, with the only difference that the side nearest the light is bright while the other is dark. For the casual observer, therefore, who pays no attention to the direction of the light, provided he is not too near to the composition, the two kinds of relief are identical.

The Greeks, who were doubtless familiar with this island relief of the Egyptians, with whom they had occasional periods of close intercourse, never introduced it into their own works. Their columns were to be seen both from a distance and close at hand. Their temples were public buildings, and the colonnades were intended to serve as shelter against the heat of the sun and the inclemency of the weather. The Egyptian island relief, which looks well at a distance, is painful to a sensitive eye near by. This is the reason why the Greeks decorated their columns, not with figures, but with simple flutings. The difference in the Egyptian and the Greek practice, therefore, offers a new invaluable proof of the delicacy of the Greek taste.


CHAPTER VIII

PHYSICAL EFFORT AND PLEASURE OF LOOK- ING AT EXTENDED COMPOSITIONS

There is a great difference between *looking* and *seeing*. One often *sees* in spite of one's self; but it takes a certain degree of mental and physical energy to *look* at an object. If a statue be placed in one's way, one cannot help seeing it. To understand its thought may imply a certain *mental* effort, but it would be improper to speak of a *physical* effort on the part of the spectator. An extended composition in either high or low relief, on the other hand, cannot be seen at a casual glance; one must *look* at it. The eye is focused on the relief; it is kept there and follows the lines which the sculptor has carved, up and down and from side to side, until the entire relief has been surveyed. This requires a very decided physical effort on the part of the spectator, who will quickly weary of his task unless the artist, by making use of all possible devices in his power, succeeds in rendering this task easy and pleasurable. The attention of the spectator, moreover, ought not to be centered in the exercise of his physical faculty of sight, because that would impede his understanding the thoughts of the artist.




EAST FRIEZE OF THE PARTHENON



WEST FRIEZE OF THE PARTHENON

From Michaelis, *Der Parthenon*, Pls. IX and XIV



If the human faculty of vision were unlimited, and following as readily the impulse directing it up as the one urging it down, or moving as willingly on the zigzag line as on the straight line, the task of the sculptor would be comparatively simple; since it is, however, very erratic and subject to many limitations, the work of the sculptor becomes very complex. The physical laws according to which the eyes move have only quite recently been ascertained by experiments, but the Greeks seem to have felt them instinctively; they certainly introduced many devices into their sculpture which are explained only if one regards them as the semiconscious endeavor to comply with the requirements of these laws. It must, however, not be believed that the sculptors willfully deviated from their original designs in order to make due allowances for the peculiarities of the eyes of the public. They were one with the public; what was unpleasant to the eyes of the people at large was unpleasant also to them, only perhaps to a greater degree. The original designs, therefore, doubtless embodied many if not all the devices which the finished works exhibit.

Even in the earliest Greek works of art such a delicate taste is noted that it is a pleasure to let one's eyes glide over their decorations. Circles are often found, rarely mathematically accurate, but on that very account infinitely more gratifying and restful to the eye than those on later vases which are drawn with a compass. It is hard to imagine a simpler geometric figure than

the circle; every point of the circumference is equally removed from the center, and the curvature is a continuous one of a fixed and never changing ratio. One imagines that one's eyes can run its circumference with perfect ease. This is, however, not the case, because the eyes glide more readily to the right and left than up and down, and more swiftly up than down. The time and effort spent in scanning the left semicircle is, therefore, different from that spent on the right. The eye that has to run around the circumference of a mathematically correct circle does not receive the impression of having run an even course. The mental image and the actual impression through the vision do not tally. If one knows the circle to be accurate, one is apt to compel one's eyes to run its circumference with even rapidity, thus doing violence to the natural character of one's vision. The inevitable result is a sensation of discomfort, and if not of actual physical pain, certainly not of pleasure. All this is avoided by the figures drawn by the Greeks. The difference in rapidity with which one's eyes glide over a circle is reflected in corresponding deviations from the mathematically correct shape; and the result is not only thorough agreement between the mental image and the visual impression but also a sensation of pleasure both mental and physical. To-day, when a great many people push their studies in geometry far enough to become thoroughly familiar with its figures, the early Greek circles

are detected to be wrong even before the eye has run their circumference, so that they often fail to give satisfaction. If one, however, can restrain the accuracy of one's scientific mind sufficiently to watch for the physical pleasure with which every eye scans figures that are designed to meet its peculiarities, one has little difficulty in deciding in favor of the Greek practice.

What is true of the circle is also true of other curves and lines, only that it is much more difficult to demonstrate it. Nor is the sensitiveness of all eyes equally pronounced; the attempt to point out all the niceties is, therefore, ill advised. Nobody, however, who carefully studies the best Greek reliefs can be unmindful of the ease with which his eyes scan the compositions, so that he not infrequently experiences the sensation of physical pleasure. The wonderful facility with which one looks along the Parthenon frieze has become almost proverbial.

There is another peculiarity of the human eye which must be taken into consideration in designing an extended composition. The eye does not glide smoothly and evenly from one end of a line to the other, but by jerky leaps and bounds, as people with sensitive eyes can find out by self-observation, and others by watching people read. A limited space can be seen at one glance; if one focuses one's eyes on one spot, one can see a short distance in every direction. In reading, therefore,

one does not begin by focusing one's eyes on the beginning of a line, but slightly to the right of it. After the words or syllables which fall within the range of the focus have been read, the eye makes a jump to the right, and so on until all the words on the line have been read. If three short words can be read at one glance, and there are nine words in the line, it will take three movements of the eye to read the line. Add only one more word, and an additional movement for this one word will be required. There is, therefore, a waste of physical energy, because the addition of three words would not require more than this one word. It is within the experience of every one that there are lines of certain lengths which can more easily be read than others.

In a relief the lines are not continuous; there are every now and then prominent masses which call for an accurate focusing of the eyes. Such masses which arrest the eye are distinguished in technical parlance from the *lines* which carry the eye, and are often called *spots*. The heads of prominent figures, their hands or elbows, the hilts of their swords, and the like, are spots. The artists who place them where the eye naturally stops in its jerky advance, save the spectator the effort of focusing his eyes upon them, and thereby do a great deal to make his task easy.

The Parthenon sculptors and their contemporaries believed in keeping the spectator continually engaged. Wherever the eye alighted, so to speak, it was to be

met by a prominent *spot*. This explains their crowded compositions: the eye was never to rest upon an empty place; for this, according to their point of view, would have been a waste of energy. The absence of empty spaces to any large extent in ancient works has often been noticed, and the term *horror vacui* has been coined. The *horror vacui* faded away in the fourth century, although it reappeared later. The sculptors of the Mausoleum in Halicarnassus (350 B.C.) apparently held that it would give more pleasure to the eye to have an occasional rest than to be obliged to survey with every movement an important part of the composition. Their reliefs, Pl. XXXII, Figs. 1 and 2, and page 46, therefore, not being crowded, leave many empty spaces to rest the eye.

Of the many devices of which the Greeks made use in their endeavor to meet the peculiarities of human vision, none is more remarkable than the practice of *isokephalism*, which required that the heads of all the figures should be practically on a level. This the Greeks seem to have felt to be a necessity for the reason that it is easier for the eye to glide along a fairly straight line than to move in zigzag. In the Parthenon frieze *isokephalism* is practiced with such delicacy that one is all but unconscious of the incongruities which arise from such a representation; as, for instance, when the heads of men on horseback are not much higher than those of men on foot, or if the heads of the horses are on a level with those of the men. In earlier times,

however, before the skill and the genius of the greatest men had taught them to combine with this device at least a seeming verisimilitude, isokephalism led to some remarkable compositions. On the frieze from Assos, Pl. II, Fig. 2, where reclining men are served by a standing boy, the necessity of having all the heads on the same level has made giants of the men and a pygmy of the boy. The willingness of the sculptors to accept rather the opprobrium of having carved a ridiculous relief than to make it less easy for the eye to look at, goes far to show how deeply the Greek artists were impressed, even in the earliest times, by the necessity not only of conceiving ideas which it is profitable and pleasant to understand but also of representing them in such a fashion that to behold them gives the spectator the sensation of physical pleasure.

CHAPTER IX

THE COLORING OF GREEK SCULPTURE

Greek sculpture for most people means sculpture of marble, and beautifully white marble at that. Bronze, however, was the favorite material of the Greeks; and all their marbles were colored.

When the Renaissance artists began to study what was left of the antique, the extant Greek or Roman statues did not show any traces of color. More than a thousand years had passed since their creation, and under the influence of the air all color had disappeared; or, if the statues were newly excavated, they were by a process of vigorous scrubbing freed from all the incrustation that their long burial had occasioned, and were thereby deprived of any traces of paint they might have preserved. The artists of the Renaissance, therefore, and the moderns after them, believed in the purity of form which did not need or even permit the addition of color. Scholars, however, at a very early date began to doubt this so-called purity of form, basing their arguments upon four well-established facts.


In the first place, the Roman Catholic Church seems to have had colored statues of saints always. The

Church is very conservative, and the practice of coloring her saints apparently dates back to her very infancy. Her infancy, however, is contemporaneous with the artistically active centuries of the early Empire, and the questions arise: If classical sculpture was not colored, where did the Christians get their different practice? or, if their practice consciously deviated from that of their secular contemporaries, why do we not find references to them in any of the early church fathers?

Second, secular sculpture, too, down to the Renaissance, was not infrequently colored. This again may very well be a survival of ancient customs, for the sculpture of those times was a descendant, however distant, of classical sculpture.

Third, the Egyptian pieces of sculpture, and probably also the Assyrian, were profusely colored. The intercourse between the Greeks and the older races was rather intimate at times; Herodotos even made a systematic study of the differences between the Greeks and the Egyptians. If he never had seen a colored statue at home he might be expected to *mention*, at least, the different practice of the Egyptians; but he is silent on this point.

Fourth, the belief of the Renaissance sculptors in the purity of form in classical times cannot be used as an argument either way, for it was obviously founded on the appearance of ancient statues in their time.



"VENUS GENETRIX"
(Louvre)

These considerations naturally raise grave doubts as to the generally accepted absence of color on Greek marbles, especially since the advocates of the *purity of form* in ancient times have advanced no better argument than that to the modern taste a deviation from it appears to be barbarous. Such an argument, being entirely subjective, is best left to itself; it needs no refutation, provided the weight of the evidence is on the other side. Evidence to this effect is gathered from three sources,—the literature of the ancients, the remains of their art, and practical experiments.

LITERARY EVIDENCE

Nowhere in ancient literature are we definitely told whether it was or was not the practice of the Greeks to paint their statues. The conclusions which Mr. Edward Robinson has drawn from the silence of ancient writers on this point are to the effect that to paint their statues was either so general a practice that it occurred to them as little to speak of it as to mention that water is wet, or that it *never* was practiced. This latter alternative is denied not only by more recent finds but also by a few definite remarks recorded in Greek and Roman literature. Pliny quotes Praxiteles as saying that he prized those of his statues the highest which the famous painter Nikias had touched (*manum admovisset*), for “so high an opinion he had of his coloring of statues” (*circumlitio*); and Plato, in

discussing the relative value of colors, makes light of the artist who, in the endeavor to put on the most beautiful part of his statue the most beautiful color, would paint the eyes golden instead of black. Such and similar passages prove conclusively that at least some statues in antiquity were colored; and this, as Mr. Robinson has pointed out, goes far to prove that it was the universal custom of the ancients to paint their marble statues.

INDICATIONS OF COLOR ON EXTANT MONUMENTS

Recent finds and careful examinations of the extant monuments strengthen this opinion. There are in the first place many statues on which traces of color have been *found*: on the Aigina pediments, for instance, and the draped female figures from the Akropolis, and the Hermes of Praxiteles; while many others clearly *indicate* that paint originally had been applied. On the grave monument of Hegeso in Athens the lady is represented as taking something out of her jewelry box and letting it glide through her fingers. She is watching the object, which itself is not sculptured, but was originally either painted or left to the imagination. The latter alternative seems more than doubtful, both because of the difficulty of imagining the object and because of the easy explanation of its omission by accepting the theory of applied paint. Then there are other statues where the uneven corrosion of the surface *suggests* the application

of color in different degrees. The stele of Aristion, Pl. III, Fig. 3, shows a well-defined star on the right shoulder lap of the cuirass. The color, which has now completely vanished, was once probably superimposed upon the body color of the cuirass; it therefore did not wear off so readily as the rest, and preserved that part of the marble which it covered from as speedy a corrosion as overtook the rest of the stele. The figure itself did not reach to the bottom of the slab, but was separated from it by a rectangular and apparently empty space. There is a very similar stele, Pl. III, Fig. 4, also in Athens, which represents the warrior painted and not sculptured. It shows the same rectangular space at the bottom, on which a painted miniature horseman still can—or at least some years ago could—be made out. Nothing is more reasonable than to suppose that the identical space of the Aristion stele was filled in the same way by the painting of a horseman. A painting at the bottom of a sculptured slab, however, seems only in place if the carved portions are not left entirely colorless.

On the Parthenon frieze hardly any accessories, such as bridles, halters, and ropes, are carved. Often holes are found, which apparently served as places of attachment for bronze bridles and the like, while at times no such holes can be noticed. The addition of bronze implements deprived the frieze of the uniformity of color anyhow, and it is not difficult to assume that where no holes are found the *necessary* accessories were

painted. It must, however, not be believed that every minor detail was either added in bronze or was painted; a great deal surely was only suggested. The introduction of color in the Parthenon frieze is entirely in keeping with the architectural scheme of the building, which was highly colored above the capitals of the columns. On this point there is no disagreement on the part of scholars.

All this certainly goes to show that the Greeks resorted to the use of color in their marble sculpture. On not a single statue, however, have any traces of paint been found on the *flesh parts*, and therefore the view is held by some that only the hair, the lips, the eyes, the drapery, and the accessories were painted; while on the nude parts only the natural glare of the marble was toned down by a process called *ganosis*. The complete disappearance of color on the smooth flesh parts during the intervening twenty centuries or more is not surprising and cannot be used as an argument, while the meaning of the words *circumlitio* and *ganosis*, both of which are used by classical writers in connection with the coloring of ancient statuary, is very obscure. The main argument, therefore, of those who believe in the colorless nude in ancient art is based solely upon the seemingly correct observation that the extremely delicate treatment of the nude in the best periods would have been an incomprehensible waste of time if it was to be covered by paint.

PRACTICAL EXPERIMENTS

It is here that the actual experiments of coloring casts of antique statues have been of importance. They establish one point beyond all question, according to Mr. Robinson and all who have seen such statues,—“and one,” says Mr. Robinson, “which will come as a surprise to many who have examined the subject only theoretically. That is, that color, even when applied as a coating, instead of diminishing the effect of the modelling, heightens it, and to a very considerable extent. Far from hiding the sculptor’s work, it brings out its beauty. The more delicately he models, the more will the color emphasize its delicacy; and if his own work be poor, the color will accentuate his defects, possibly because it brings him into comparison with nature. This is shown to a remarkable degree in the heads of *our* two statues. That of the Venus (Genetrix) usually passes for a fairly good head, and is sometimes spoken of even with enthusiasm for its delicate contour and subtle smile. [The praise is very undeserved!] But colored it becomes hard and dry; the modelling of the cheeks, and especially about the nose, is meagre, betraying the hand of the copyist more than any other part of the statue; and defects in the modelling of the mouth and chin, hardly perceptible in the white, become unpleasantly apparent. In no part of either statue did Mr. Smith have to work so hard, or to try as many

experiments in order to produce a result which would be on a par with the rest. The head of the Hermes, on the contrary, shows the marvelous beauty of modelling much more effectively under the color than in the white cast. The exquisite modulations are so much more apparent when painted, that by contrast the white cast has a curious empty look. And what is true of the heads is equally true of other portions of the statues. The body and drapery of the Venus are modelled much more finely than the head, and the colors emphasize this fact.

“If these experiments teach nothing else, they will at least demonstrate that the addition of color, instead of enabling the sculptor to slur his work, subjects him to new and severe exactions; and hence they offer a suggestion as to one of the most important factors in the rapid rise to perfection of Greek Sculpture.”

Such experiments, though they hardly can be said to have *proved* the application of color on the nude parts of Greek statues, have nevertheless shifted the responsibility of a proof to the other side. Color was used on ancient marbles; the addition of color on all parts, even the nude, is perfectly possible, and therefore in the absence of definite data apparently the natural thing and moreover perfectly in keeping with colored terra cottas, many of which are believed to be made in imitation of statues, and in full agreement with the paintings of colored statues in Pompeii.

THE SELECTION OF COLORS

With the question of color application fairly well settled, another and more difficult one presents itself: in other words, *What* colors were selected and how were they applied? Were the statues painted in representation of reality? There is no information whatsoever to be gleaned from ancient literature, and the few dots of paint actually to be found on the marbles are of little consequence. In the first place they may represent only the body color, while the actual shade which was seen may, and probably has, disappeared; and in the second place even they surely have faded and been changed under the influence of the air or the mineral ingredients of the soil whence the statues have been rediscovered. In coloring the two casts in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, as described by Mr. Robinson, Mr. Smith apparently acted on the assumption that the colors applied to the drapery of a statue were the same as those used in dyeing the actual garments worn by the Greeks. This, however, is no doubt a mistake. The Greek statues did not exhibit actual garments, but rather, in keeping with the mental images represented in the statues, the *conceptions* of garments. They were *not* real, so that the application of the *real* color is entirely out of place. The effect of Mr. Smith's colored casts, therefore, was decidedly unpleasant, and it is no matter of regret

that they have since been withdrawn from exhibition. Another attempt may turn out more successful, but it will always be impossible to decide just *what* colors were applied, and *how*, unless perhaps some unexpected discoveries in the future advance definite hints in this direction.

POSSIBLE OBJECTIONS

The first prominent man to espouse the cause of the advocates of the application of color in Greek marbles was Quatremère de Quincy, who drew many of his conclusions from the highly colored temple images in gold and ivory. Since then the general trend of science has been in his direction, until it may be safely said that now all scholars who take the pains of investigating the question at all, come to much the same conclusion. They do so, however, in spite of some flaws in the argument, and a few considerations which, it cannot be denied, may militate against it.

The most formidable objection is the fact that the Romans were in the habit of copying Greek bronzes in marble. There is no indication whatever that the slavish Roman copyist painted his copies of his own accord. Painted and unpainted marble statues were therefore in existence side by side; but a great deal has been made of the argument that either none or all of the ancient marbles were painted. It is true that the marble copies of bronzes belong to Roman

times, but so do the majority of the writers from whose silence on this point the conclusions were drawn. It may of course be possible that Roman marble copies of bronzes received a bronze coating, but since this is nowhere mentioned it does not seem to be likely. Pliny, moreover, speaks of a Greek marble statue in Rome wearing sandals without the straps. Originally, therefore, the straps probably were painted; the paint had completely worn off, and when Pliny saw the statue it was uncolored. This seems to show that the Romans, at least, were not entirely unaccustomed to seeing unpainted marble statues. And if this is so, the question arises, When was the practice of coloring statues discontinued? The earliest Greek works were not carved in marble, but in very soft stone. It was so soft that the paint was thoroughly absorbed, and the remains of this early stone sculpture in Athens show that all were completely covered with paint. This early practice doubtless was continued when marble was introduced. If the conclusion is correct, that the Romans in the time of Pliny, that is in the first century of our era, were accustomed to see also unpainted statues, then a change must have taken place somewhere during these six centuries from early Greek times to Pliny. The references to Praxiteles, and the actual traces of paint found in the hair and on the sandals of his Hermes, show that in the fourth century before Christ the painting of marble statues was still practiced.

A complete change, therefore, if it took place at all, must have occurred at some subsequent time; when, it is beyond our knowledge to ascertain.

Such and similar considerations which apparently militate against the universal use of color on Greek marble statues must not be taken too seriously. They show how impossible it is to make a perfectly clear case out of anything that happened two millennia ago; but they are, if compared with the strong arguments in favor of the practically universal custom in Greece of painting marble statues, too slight and too uncertain to have great weight.

One point may be said to have been proved conclusively, and that is that ancient marbles did *not habitually* exhibit the "colorless purity of form." The final proof to the effect that they *never* exhibited it, is still outstanding. All recent discoveries, however, and all investigations have gone to argue in its favor. It is therefore not unreasonable to expect that before long the present *theory* of the coloring of ancient statuary may have become a universally accepted *fact*.


CHAPTER X

ART CONDITIONS BEFORE THE SEVENTH CENTURY B.C.

The middle of the seventh century before Christ, now generally taken as the beginning of historic Greek sculpture, is not marked by any especially important historical event. Very gradually the mist rises which hides the preceding centuries from the investigator's eyes, and it is not until one more century has passed that he feels on sure ground. No extant Greek statue, however fragmentary, can be dated earlier than between 650 or 625 B.C.; beyond that lie the dark middle ages of Greece. The Greeks themselves had a very hazy notion of that period: some definite facts were remembered across the ages, others were invented to explain existing conditions, and everything was gathered round a few popular heroes, whose characters, if they really had existed, were so boldly altered that they could no longer be distinguished from the creations of fiction. Such legends are interesting, but they may be readily dismissed in the discussion of actual facts. Discoveries made by the archæologists and the anthropologists are here of greater importance, because they are probably as accurate as they unfortunately are scant.

The inhabitants of Greece, of the islands, of the Ægean, and of the coast of Asia Minor belonged to the Aryan race, which at a very early time, coming perhaps from Asia, perhaps from some part in northern Europe, had divided into five prominent families. Each one of these families and branches of families had again subdivided, and the prominent branches of the Greeks were the Aiolians, the Ionians, and the Dorians. The Dorians were perhaps the latest comers and apparently the least civilized. Long before their arrival, at about 1100 B.C., the others, it is believed, had established a very flourishing civilization in Greece. The first finds of this early civilization to command general attention were made in Mycenæ in 1876 by Dr. Schliemann; and because it was at the time believed that the Mycenæans were the only ones who had thus far advanced on the road of human progress, this civilization was called the *Mycenæan Age*. Very soon, however, it was found that other people had shared the blessings of this age. For want of a better name, however, and because of its familiarity the term "Mycenæan civilization" has been retained, in spite of the fact that scholars to-day look for the center and the origin of the flourishing conditions in Crete.

The date of the Mycenæan Age is fixed, chiefly by means of contemporaneous Egyptian events, from about 1600 to 1100 B.C. The earlier date is still very uncertain, and some recent discoveries seem to show that it



"APOLLO" OF TENEA
(Munich)

ought to be placed much farther back, perhaps even in the third millennium before Christ. Earlier than this nothing is known of the Greeks. How long they had been in the country, whether they brought any civilization with them, whether the Mycenæan civilization was their first attempt or only the revival of an older one that had crumbled away,—all this eludes our most painstaking investigation.

Thanks to the indefatigable efforts of the archæologists of all nations, the art life of the Mycenæan Age is to-day fairly well known. Sculpture, to judge of the remains, was little practiced, for the lionesses over the citadel gate of Mycenæ, Pl. IV, Fig. 1, are the only extant works of consequence. Painting, more especially wall painting, was much in favor, and the fragmentary figures of an extended fresco in the great palace of King Minos in Crete which have been brought to light, exhibit daring in composition and great delicacy of lines. The minor arts, however, notably the goldsmith's art, were very flourishing. Hundreds of magnificent works of this kind are in existence, which, taken together with the many thousands of small ornamented trinkets from the opened graves, give a rather complete idea of the aims and achievements of these early artists. The artists were not working for show, as is often the case with crude people who have much accumulated wealth; for though they worked in gold, it is not the splendor of the expensive material that

impresses the spectator, but the delicate shape into which it has been wrought and the refined taste which is shown in the selection of its ornaments. In spite of this fact, human figures and animals rarely occur. The majority of the patterns are fanciful inventions of the artist's mind, but they are never grotesque or complex or overdone; they are simple spirals, circles, curves, or other unpretentious figures. The artists who made these works and the people for whom they were made, apparently were blessed with an intense love for the beautiful and a temperament of great simplicity.

Somewhere about 1100 B.C. this flourishing civilization suddenly lapsed, long before it had reached what could possibly be called decline leading to decay. It is therefore clear that some important historical event must have occurred at that time, and this was probably the Dorian invasion. It did not take place all at once, but probably extended over a period of at least a century. The country was well settled, and when the Dorians kept pushing from the north, many of the old inhabitants had to yield and leave their homes. Most of the people of the Peloponnesos probably emigrated to Asia Minor, while those that remained, like the Messenians, were doomed to eternal slavery. In the turmoil of readjustment no time was left for artistic expressions. Mr. Ruskin once said, "Art is possible only, when after satisfying the needs of daily life, there is enough

mental and physical energy left for 'play'; and during these struggling times, when some were defending their old homes and others were fighting for their new country, neither time nor energy could be spared for "play." By about 1000 B.C. all the Dorians were in their new seats, but centuries had yet to pass before conditions were at all settled. These three hundred and fifty years to the beginning of historic Greece have been well named the dark middle ages of Greece. They are indeed dark, with only one ray of light in them,—the Homeric poems. It matters little whether the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were written by one man, or whether they were the compilation of many poets; whether they were first sung in the ninth century or only shortly before 650 B.C. The important fact is that subsequent to the downfall of the Mycenæan civilization, and before the dawn of historic times, there were people who could sing such songs and others who could enjoy them.

The civilization described in the Homeric poems is apparently a mixture of the memories of glorious times in the continental homes and of the idealization of the poet's own surroundings. The arts have a very inferior position in them, and the finest articles described seem to be of Oriental importation. This goes to show that the arts really had as completely disappeared in Greece as the absence of remains indicates. Gem cutting alone flourished to some extent. Most of the finds of this

kind, however, were made on the islands of the Ægean, and are therefore known as *island gems*. They differ considerably, not only in shape and decoration but also in workmanship, from the earlier Mycenæan gems.

When by the middle of the seventh century the political conditions of Greece were sufficiently settled to allow of a renewed expression in art, the skill of hand of the Mycenæan artists was entirely lost. It was, moreover, in a new direction that the Greeks began to express themselves; for whereas sculpture before the Dorian invasion had been but little fostered, it now began to be the foremost art of the people. Painting probably at all times was its worthy second, although the perishableness of pictures does not now enable us to appreciate this fact.

To what extent the historic Greeks were indebted to their early ancestors for the inheritance of a delicately æsthetic temper, is a question which can never be satisfactorily answered. If one assumes that much of the Greek love of the beautiful was inherited through the centuries in spite of the Doric invasion, one finds less difficulty in explaining the wonderfully rapid advance in the arts after the first and very crude beginnings. This advance, indeed, was so sudden that many have looked for influences outside of Greece to explain it, but in her sculpture at least Greece was independent of the influences of any one of the countries that

can at all come under consideration in this connection, — Phœnicia, Assyria, and Egypt.

The Phœnicians were the traders of antiquity until their place was taken by the Ionian Greeks. They facilitated the intercourse between the intellectual creations of the several people; but although highly gifted they never had much of an art life themselves. In their country hardly any pieces of sculpture have been found, and therefore they could not have had any direct influence upon the development of sculpture in Greece.

The Babylonian and Assyrian is perhaps the oldest known civilized race of the world, dating back to many thousands of years before Christ. Their country was very poor in stone, especially in the south, where their first achievements were made. The north was richer in this material, which for primitive sculpture is indispensable; but even there sculpture was not very popular. Figures in the round are extremely few; while relief sculpture was not fully developed until the times of Assur-Nazir-Pal (in the ninth century B.C.), and especially Assur-Bani-Pal, who is better known as Sardanapalos (668–626 B.C.). The differences between Assyrian and Greek sculpture, moreover, are so many and so obvious that no one can long believe that any help was derived by the Greeks from this quarter, at least in their sculpture. In their vase paintings and other minor arts Oriental influences are undeniable.

THE RELATION OF GREEK SCULPTURE TO EGYPTIAN SCULPTURE

With the Egyptians it is different, for a somewhat superficial resemblance between the earliest Greek statues and a certain type of figures well known in Egypt has led many to believe that Greece was much indebted to Egypt in all that regards the art of sculpture. This view has seemed especially plausible because the beginnings of sculpture in Greece almost coincide with the reassumption of close commercial relations between the two countries when Psammetic (663-610 B.C.) opened his kingdom to foreigners, and the Greeks founded there the commercial colony of Naukratis. The beginning of sculpture, however, and the founding of Naukratis need have no immediate connection beyond being the simultaneous expressions of an active race, which at last had found sufficient peace and leisure at home to exert itself in different directions.

The Egyptians were a very old race with a proud past, the records of which were preserved, cut or painted upon stone in temples and graves. Every event was dated by the reigns of the kings, and since the list of kings is rather well known, one has comparatively little difficulty in compiling a history of Egypt reaching back for thousands of years. The Egyptians themselves, however, though they knew how

to reckon by years, computed their history by dynasties, that is, continuous reigns of kings belonging to one definite family. It is therefore not always possible to assign to an event or a dynasty its equivalent date in years. Occasionally one is assisted by the record of some natural phenomenon the accurate date of which is known; as, for instance, the occurrence of an eclipse during the reign of a certain king, or by contemporaneous and datable events of Assyrian or Greek history. In spite of the uncertainty of some dates most scholars now agree that the first known dynasty of Egyptian kings dates at least three or four thousand years before Christ.

The earliest Egyptian monuments are the best because they are the most genuine art expressions; those of later times are sometimes distinguished by a delightful grace in outlines and in masses, but they never again accurately render the peoples' conceptions. Egyptian art conceptions may be said to have fossilized after the first twelve dynasties, for the subsequent revivals in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties (ca. 1600-1100 B.C.), and in the twenty-sixth dynasty (663-525 B.C.) were almost exclusively concerned with the outward appearances of the statues and had little to do with thoughts expressed in them.

Standing statues (cf. Pl. III, Fig. 1) were carved all through the years that ancient Egypt lasted. The statues stand erect, generally with the left foot in advance,

and since this is also the position of some of the earliest Greek statues, it is here that some writers believe the Greeks received their help; there are people who even say that the Greeks set themselves actually to copy the Egyptian statues. Nothing can be less true. The Egyptians took special pains with the head and the features, the body receiving only passing attention; in Greece the head, from the earliest times, was only one of the parts of the body and not entitled to greater care than any other part. This alone ought to suffice to disprove any actual copying of the Egyptian works of art on the part of the early Greeks, not to speak of the different spirit which pervades the creations of the two peoples. A joyous prophecy of better things to come greets one in the Greek statues, while not even the best Egyptian statues after 1000 B.C. disguise the fact that they are, to a certain extent, the senile creations of a fossilized art. How is it possible to believe that the young Greek artists went to Egypt to cultivate their taste, and after having been in the company of the conventional statues of the Egyptians, returned home to carve figures which in execution are as far below the Egyptian as they are ahead of them in joyous conception!

There is not a single point of resemblance between these statues, except the superficial one of the pose; and this may very well be accidental and due to the necessity of solving identical problems. Reasoning from

accidental resemblances is always dangerous and ought to be avoided. When some thirty years ago Mr. Rimmer was asked to design a statue of Hamilton for a site on Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, he decided to carve his figure not of marble but of local granite. Brittle granite was the material most frequently used by the Egyptians, and without realizing it Mr. Rimmer found himself compelled to make allowances for the peculiarities of his material, which were almost entirely Egyptian. The figure is carved in one solid mass, from which neither the arms nor the legs can detach themselves; the pose is very straight and stiff, and the drapery, hanging low in the back, takes the place of the Egyptian supporting pillar which was introduced to give stability to the statues. The American statue of Hamilton, carved in the nineteenth century by one of the most accomplished anatomists of America, is clearly Egyptian in execution, and yet it is known that nothing was farther from Mr. Rimmer's mind than to *copy* the practices of those ancient people.

Granting, therefore, that the early Greeks did not intend to copy their neighbors across the Mediterranean, it may still be possible—though not necessarily probable—that they borrowed from the Egyptians the idea of representing their men standing with the left leg in advance. Mr. Gardner calls this the borrowing of the alphabet of art. But even if this view is correct it does not mean that the Greeks received any actual

help from the Egyptians; for if suddenly the Zulus or the Hottentots felt the necessity of expressing their ideas in writing, and in the absence of letters of their own were to borrow the English alphabet, it surely would not follow that their literature was in the least indebted to English thought.

In their sculpture, then, the historic Greeks received no help from the outside, nor had they any monuments of a great past art to teach them; on the contrary they evolved everything from within, from the nobility, hopefulness, and genuineness of their own character.

CHAPTER XI


MATERIAL, TECHNIQUE, DESTRUCTIVE FORCES, EARLY IGNORANCE, AND SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE

The material of Greek sculpture was largely either bronze or stone. It is now well known that in later years bronze was far more extensively used than marble; but in the beginning the Greeks probably turned more readily to stone, and in the very beginning, perhaps, to wood. The Greek climate is less clement than the Egyptian, so that no wood sculptures have been preserved. On the mainland of Greece and especially in Athens the artists used soft local stones, "tufa" or "poros," which were easily carved and offered few obstacles to the unskilled hand. Later a harder stone, generally marble, was used. Parian and Naxian marble were the first to enjoy general popularity, until they were largely superseded in the fifth century by the Pentelic marble, at least for Athenian use. The neighboring Mt. Hymettos, also near Athens, offered another very acceptable but somewhat bluish marble. In whiteness none of the Greek marbles can compare with the beautiful product from Carrara, which was not known to the ancients before Roman imperial times.

The earlier Greek sculptors in marble probably worked on the block itself without first making life-sized models. It is even doubtful whether they made any models at all. Later models, perhaps in clay or plaster, were used, and an inscription from Epidauros in the fourth century B.C. is probably correctly interpreted to mean that Timotheos received a certain sum of money for making the models for the pedimental groups of the temple which were to be executed by inferior artists; while in the first century B.C. great sculptors realized much money by the sale of their models alone. In the best times, however, the execution in marble was certainly not intrusted to workmen but was always done by the artists themselves. The practice of piecing marble was known and extensively made use of at a very early date.

A bronze statue requires the preparatory completion of an accurate model. In modern times such models are composed of many pieces, all of which are cast separately and finally joined together. The ancients, on the contrary, seem to have preferred casting their figures in as few pieces as possible. One of the most recent acquisitions of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, which consists of the lower half of a life-sized draped statue, was cast in one entire piece.

Bronze is an alloy of various metals. Copper, zinc, and tin compose modern statuary bronze; in ancient times it seems to have contained a small addition of



ARTEMIS OF GABII
(Louvre)



lead. This metal has the unpleasant quality of rendering the molten mass less even, and is therefore rarely used in modern times; it makes the alloy, however, softer and less brittle, and thus enables the artist to put some finishing touches on the statue after it is cast. The great advantage of this is that some of the most delicate modeling need not be put on the form, where it is apt to be lost in the process of casting, but may be introduced on the statue itself.

The finished bronze, according to Pliny, was rubbed over with bitumen, probably to give to its three or four separately cast parts a uniform gloss without greatly altering their natural color. In modern times bronzes often are treated with acids to give them an artificial *patina*. This is done because it takes a long time to have the bronze oxidize under the influence of the air, to the peculiarly pleasing green hue noticed on antique statues, called patina; and also because modern bronze casters, for technical reasons, are less careful in mixing the alloy with a view to its ultimate appearance. Some modern statues, moreover, which were left to oxidize under the sole influence of the air, have been found to show an unpleasantly dirty black patina, the reason for which is unknown, though it is believed that the dirt and soot of the large commercial cities of to-day may be responsible for it. The bluish patina found on bronzes discovered in Pompeii and the greenish one on those from Herculaneum are probably due to the

mineral ingredients of the soil and the ashes or lava in which the statues were buried for almost eighteen centuries. The ancients used several different kinds of alloy,—the Delian, Argive, and Aiginetan,—but it is not known to what degree the one differed from the other, nor what were their several advantages.

Gold and silver were also used for dedicatory statues, but these materials were poorly adapted to sculpture, for their intrinsic value and glittering surface necessarily prevented the statue from making its full appeal to the spectator. If gold was an unsatisfactory material in which to cast entire statues, it was on the contrary well adapted to the decoration and ornamentation of the drapery of large temple images. Many such images of gold and ivory, called *chryselephantine*, were built up around a wooden core, with ivory for the nude parts and gold for the drapery. They were especially frequent during the age of Perikles, when Pheidias finished in this style his huge Zeus in Olympia and his Athena in the Parthenon at Athens. When the money did not suffice, polished marble was substituted for the ivory, and gilded wood for the gold; the effect of such *akrolithic* statues was probably much the same as the effect of those made of the more costly materials.

DESTRUCTIVE FORCES

That none of the chryselephantine statues, and only one in gold (now in Madrid), has been preserved to our day, is not in the least surprising, owing to the market value of the materials; but it is astonishing to learn that of the entire wealth of Greek statuary, both of stone and of bronze, hardly a small fraction of one per cent has come down to us, and that of the originals only one can be assigned to any of the great sculptors. Several forces have combined to bring about this state of affairs.

Time itself, of course, has proved to be very destructive. Left to themselves few marble, and no wooden, statues have been able to endure the annual changes of the Greek climate or the frequent earthquakes which have laid low the majority of the Greek temples. The Romans, too, despoiled the conquered country of many statues. Sulla alone carried several hundred of them away from Delphi, and Caligula even attempted to remove the colossal Zeus from Olympia to Rome. When the statues were removed by wholesale they were detached from their bases, on which the artists had engraved their names; and when the ships were unloaded in Italy all means of identification, except in the case of a few famous pieces, were lost. The Romans were extremely fond of statues, without at first being willing to make many of their own; and

since not even the thousands which were shipped from Greece filled the demand, they set about to copy those they liked best. Marble in Italy was very cheap and labor was cheaper, and these Roman copies, therefore, took the place of the modern plaster casts for the decoration of libraries, halls, villas, gardens, and the like. The originals imported from Greece, with nobody to care for them, gradually disappeared. Some doubtless were again removed to adorn the new capital when the empire was divided into a western and an eastern half; others were broken in the turbulent times which followed upon the northern invasion after A.D. 375; and still others were buried, partly in the ruins of the buildings where they stood, partly by loving owners who desired to preserve them from the enemy and never had the opportunity of bringing them again to light. Of the many which remained in Greece some were wantonly destroyed by the Goths and other invaders, while not a few fell victims to the vulgar zeal of the early Christians, who carried their hatred of the ancient gods to the extent of breaking the statues which had adorned their sacred precincts.

In spite of all these destructive forces, many more statues would still have been preserved if it had not been for the incredible vandalism of the inhabitants. Reverence for the antique was unknown to them, and until Greece was liberated in the nineteenth century from the Turkish yoke, generation after generation

pillaged what was left of ancient works of art. Marble reliefs and large statues, if cut in pieces, are excellent building material; and there probably are few villages in modern Greece where at least one statue or relief could not be discovered if the houses were torn down.

The most formidable of all agents, however, working toward the utter destruction of Greek marbles, is connected with the very excellence of the material; for it makes the best lime. Statue after statue has found its way to the limekiln, because it was much easier to take the statues at hand than to quarry new blocks. Bronzes, on the other hand, were melted to realize the market value of the metal, which always was high.

With these numerous forces at work, and some of them uninterruptedly for more than two thousand years, the wonder no longer is that so few statues have been preserved but that so many have escaped destruction. Recent excavations have brought many of them to light, some from the ruins of the sacred precincts where they had been erected and finally forgotten, — the *Hermes of Praxiteles* among them; and others from the structures into which they were built by the unappreciative inhabitants, as for instance the large friezes of the altar at Pergamon, which were used by the Turks to strengthen their walls. Many of these works were carefully looked for; others have come to light unexpectedly. The most notable instance of this kind was the cargo of a shipwrecked Roman vessel discovered off Cape

Malea two years ago. Unfortunately the influence of the salt water and volcanic upheavals of the bottom of the sea have badly damaged what fate itself seems to have begrudged the greedy Romans.

Several other works were for a time almost miraculously preserved from destruction, as for instance the Parthenon. It was early changed to a Christian church and afterwards to a mosque, and even the barbaric tastes of the later inhabitants of Athens spared the building and its sculptured decorations. But when the holy war broke out against the Turks, and Christian armies set out from everywhere to drive the barbarians from European soil, then the building was utterly destroyed. The Italian General Morosini had orders to attack the Mussulmans in Athens; they retreated to the Akropolis, and confident that the civilized Christians would show reverence to the building which even they had spared, they stored their powder in the Parthenon. Morosini had hardly learned of it when he turned his guns upon the Parthenon, and on September 26, 1687, the Parthenon was blown up. Not all the sculptured decorations were destroyed in the explosion; but once begun, the destruction was vigorously continued, and slab after slab wandered into the limekiln, while many other pieces were wantonly destroyed. It is written in official records that the heads of figures, both on the frieze and on the metopes, were used as targets for pistol practice by the Turks.

EARLY IGNORANCE OF GREEK SCULPTURE

The Romans had only a very slight knowledge of Greek sculpture, and in the Middle Ages even this disappeared. Greece was a lost world,—so completely lost that when the interest in humanistic matters burst forth in the early Renaissance, there was not a man in Italy or northern Europe who knew the language. Greek scholars had to be imported from Byzantium. Nothing was dated farther back than Rome, and everything was looked at with Roman eyes. A Greek statue of Zeus had become a Jupiter, Hermes was known as Mercury, Aphrodite as Venus. Our own civilization is the direct descendant of the Renaissance; and although in the field of ancient sculpture we now have gone farther back than they,—we have gone to Greece herself,—many of the earlier notions which were derived from the study of the Roman view of Greek sculpture still cling to us, and among other things we still wrongly persevere in calling the Greek gods and goddesses by their Roman names. Jupiter, it is true, was the Roman father of the gods, just as Zeus was the Greek; but the characters of the two gods were not at all alike. The Greek Aphrodite as goddess of love was an entirely different deity from the lustful Roman conception of Venus. In speaking of Greek statues, therefore, it is more correct, and consequently decidedly preferable, to use the Greek names; not to mention the fact that

the musical quality of the Greek names renders them generally more pleasing to the ear.

When Winckelmann in the middle of the eighteenth century first sounded the note of honest and unbiased study of the past, a great mass of unarranged material had been gathered in the various museums. The painstaking labor of his successors has brought order out of this chaos by a judicious use of the only two sources whence an accurate knowledge can be derived.

SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE

These sources are, in the first place, monumental, and secondly, literary. The monumental sources consist primarily of the comparatively few originals and the great wealth of Roman copies; also of inscriptions, vase paintings, terra cottas, coins, and other objects, on which the original statues were either mentioned or reproduced. The literary sources include all the references to art contained in ancient literature. Some men, like Pliny the Elder (died A.D. 79) and Pausanias (second century), wrote of art; others simply made incidental references to illustrate their thoughts. Great care must therefore be exercised in using the criticisms of the ancients, especially since the writers are not all equally trustworthy. Many statements, of course, were based on contemporaneous and reliable authors whose writings are now lost; but since few of the Romans followed the practice of Pliny, who frequently cited his



BRONZE FIGURE FROM A SHIPWRECKED ROMAN CARGO
(Athens)



authorities, it is at times impossible to distinguish between the inaccurate Roman notions and the often correct ideas quoted from older Greek writers.

This confused state of the literary sources, together with their importance, is largely responsible for the fact that the subject has been for almost a century exclusively in the hands of the archæologists and philologists, and so lost to the general public. Without the untiring labor of these men it would even now be impossible to draw definite conclusions; yet their knowledge concerns for the most part what may be called the grammar of art. There is a vast difference between studying a language grammatically and entering into the spirit of its literature. Literary disquisitions are impossible without the preliminary and accurate knowledge of grammar, but the *mere* matter-of-fact interest in the linguistic peculiarities of a language is always detrimental to the comprehension of the thoughts expressed in its literature. Ancient art in the same way must, in spite of much serious study, remain a closed book to all who do not go beyond the facts, to all who refuse to look for the spirit and the principles of Greek sculpture.



PART TWO

CHAPTER XII

THE FIRST ATTEMPTS: IN THE ROUND

The first Greek to carve a statue worthy the name was, according to tradition, Daidalos,—that is, translated, “the Skillful.” All legends of miraculous skill were gathered around him; “his statues saw and walked, and, in a word, exercised all the bodily functions.” The Greeks were ever impatient of abstract and unattached ideas! A man named Daidalos may actually have lived, and in that case a little bronze statuette of Artemis in Boston, dedicated to the “Daidaleian,” may repeat one of his types. The word “Daidaleian,” however, is possibly merely an epithet of the goddess, “the skillful Artemis,” bearing no reference to the traditional name of the first sculptor. This is the more likely to be the case since none of the literary references to Daidalos are proven to be more than records of myths. He himself is now generally believed to be a creation of fiction. His reputed pupils and contemporaries, however, are, at least in part, real characters;

for the names of some of them have been found inscribed on stone in several places.

READY EXCHANGE OF ARTISTIC IDEALS

The wide range of territory covered by these places gives an excellent idea of the extensive intercourse and the ready exchange of artistic ideals in earliest Greece. Literary tradition points in the same direction. The Athenian Daidalos founded — so the story goes — a school of sculpture in Crete. His pupils worked in Crete, Rhodes, Ambracia, and in the Peloponnesos; others again in Athens, Ephesos, Arcadia, Samos, and Lemnos; and artists of the separate and rival schools of Samos and Chios covered the land from Ephesos to Naukratis in Egypt and back again to Athens. In Bœotia a grave stele was found which was made by Alxenor of Naxos; and several fragments from the Akropolis in Athens show such marked differences from the native Athenian style, and are so much like works found in Samos and in Bœotia, that the conclusion is inevitable that they were either imported into Athens from the outside or were made in Athens by foreign sculptors.

THE DORIAN AND THE IONIAN SCHOOLS INDISTINGUISHABLE

Such observations show the futility of the attempt of dividing what is left of Greek art before the Persian wars into two large classes, — the Dorian and the

Ionian. These two branches of the Greek race, it is often believed, were fundamentally different in character and disposition. The Dorian mountain shepherds and farmers were slow, conservative, honest, gifted with beautiful bodies and careful to preserve their usefulness. The Ionian city folk, traders and merchants, were progressive, restless, of an "intense intellectual curiosity," of laxer morals, and fond of luxurious drapery. Such fundamental differences in character one would think ought to be reflected in the sculpture of the people. This is, however, rarely the case. In the first place, the ready intercourse tended to even up differences; and in the second, neither the sternest Dorians nor the most luxuriant Ionians were apt to create great artists. The best plan, therefore, is to look upon the older works as a joint expression of all the Greeks, showing at times it is true different tendencies, as either the Dorian or the Ionian side of the artist preponderated, but on the whole tending all toward one great end,—mastery over the material and clearer expression of more definite conceptions.

THE "HERA" OF SAMOS

One of the earliest statues worthy of description was found in Samos, where it had been dedicated to Hera by a woman named Cheramydes. The statue, page 106, now headless, may or may not represent Hera herself. In the absence, however, of a better name it is

most readily referred to as the "Hera" of Samos. It would not do to be too particular in the designation of many of these early creations. If it is once understood that the accuracy of the names cannot be established, no harm is done; and the advantage of a distinguishing nomenclature is so great that it outweighs all contrary considerations.

The "Hera" of Samos is carved from a circular block tapering toward the base, much like the column between the lionesses over the gate of Mycenæ, Pl. IV, Fig. 1. The shape being given, the artist had to design his figure within its limits. This has hampered him in carving the right arm. He also desired to have some variety, and that accounts for the position of the left arm.¹ The anatomy here is fairly well understood; one feels through the drapery the softness of the biceps and its surrounding parts, the turn at the elbow, and the tendons running down toward the hand. The man who knew how to carve all this chafed under the restraint of space, and made at least the attempt to explain the compression of the upper right arm where it ought to project, by having the figure stretch it down with all her might. This, however, led him into another difficulty: such muscular action ought to be explained by the character or by the momentary state

¹ The descriptions are made from the original statues, or, in a few instances, from their casts. They often include, therefore, details which are lost in photographs.



"HERA" OF SAMOS
(Louvre)



of mind of the person. But that, of course, was beyond this early artist's means.

The figure itself, though unmistakably a woman, is carved in its lower half, where the original shape of the block permitted no freedom of action, in a rather non-descript fashion. The projecting feet and the drapery curving over them are its best parts. It is easy to imagine the actual shape of the feet, even where they are not seen; they are suggested. Quite unknown to himself the artist has stumbled on one of the important principles of art,—that the spectator can be impressed as much by those lines and masses that are suggested as by those that are represented. If the artist of the “Hera” had known this, he would have given his figure a better lower half in spite of the shape of the block. As it is, he has carved something that, if broken, never would impress one as a part of a human body. To make up for this lack of life the drapery has been delicately treated; so delicately, in fact, that no photograph renders it adequately. “Hera” was draped in two garments; some say three or more, but that is a mistake due to the fact that the artist left the distinguishing part to the painter. The different surfaces and folds are intended to bring pleasing variety into the composition, but not one is an actual copy or adaptation of nature. The artist carved what he thought was a drapery, without checking the accuracy of his conception by any, even the hastiest, observation of nature.

This lack of nature study is characteristic of the entire figure. "Hera's" proportions are anatomically impossible; in the back, where the garments are represented tightly gathered about the body, their inaccuracy is especially noticeable. Unable to carve a draped figure that would show the drapery and suggest the living body, the artist hit upon this means of displaying the nicety of the drapery in front and of revealing the body in the back.

With all its shortcomings, there is a truly noble and undeniable grandeur about the statue. Winckelmann says, "If you want to judge of a work of art, disregard at first what is clamouring for attention in it because of the diligent labor and the skill of the artist; be rather concerned with that part of it which is the creation of intelligence"; or, "If it is a primitive work of art," he might have added, "be not disturbed by the lack of skill, but look for the conception." This precept of Winckelmann is as accurate as it is (especially for the student of early Greek sculpture) difficult to follow. The mistakes there are patent, sometimes exciting the spectator's mirth, so that it is surely not easy to penetrate to the nobility of the conception. Patient endeavor in this direction, however, and continuous practice are sure to lead to the desired result.

Great assistance is derived from the study of those statues which show the development of the same type, because they reveal what the artists endeavored to do. The gradual development of the draped female figure,

for instance, the mastery over the material slowly and painfully obtained by constant practice, and the growing facility of expression are advantageously studied in a series of statues excavated in Athens some twenty years ago. A draped figure, however, offers a double problem to the sculptor,—the body and the garment. It is easier, therefore, to follow this progress in art, step by step, in the male figures, which with few exceptions are nude. The large majority of these male figures were found in sanctuaries of Apollo; wherefore all of them go by the name of this god, though many may be intended to represent mortals.

THE "APOLLO" STATUES

The original shape of the block for these statues was, it seems, always regular, either square or cylindrical, often tapering, but never especially adapted to the design. On the contrary, the design had to be adapted to the block. One may call this a convention, or a custom, or a fancy; the fact remains that for several generations such a restriction was tolerated, though all manner of means were devised to make it less patent. The adherence to some customary practice is a characteristic sign of this period. The customs were iron-clad. It seems never to have occurred to the artists that they were of their own making and could be disregarded with impunity. As long as they lasted they were as confining, in their field, as the boundaries of

the country were, before the Persian wars, for little Greece, constantly threatened by the barbarians, with all the chaos that this name implied.

One of the earliest "Apollos," Pl. IV, Fig. 3, was found on the island of Thera. The arms cling to the sides very straight; they push down with muscular force in order to keep within the confines of the block; only at the elbows they are detached, but as slightly as possible. The artist was apparently afraid they might break off unless fastened to the side of the body. Looking, however, along the whole row of these "Apollos," one notices how with every subsequent attempt the sculptor dared a little more and a little more, until in the "Apollo" of Tenea, page 80, the entire arm was carved free, and only the hands were secured by keeping a small bridge between them and the thighs. What a tremendous achievement this was from the point of view of the earlier sculptor! How could a man dare to brave the fitful fancies of brittle marble! But it was done, and soon more was done. In the Strangford "Apollo," Pl. IV, Fig. 2, even the bridges have disappeared. The arms once hung loose from the shoulders; now they are broken and lost,—the artist of Thera would say as a just punishment for the man who was too bold. Who can tell how many blocks were spoiled by daring too much before the conviction took hold of the artists that it could be done, and therefore must be done! In this entire period of struggle

with the material one does not find a single retrograde movement, however impossible it must have seemed at times to accomplish anything better than what had already been achieved; for the Greek artist was like

One who never turned his back, but marched breast forward,
Never doubted.

Success due to Much Clear Thinking

His victory over the material was slow compared with the advance made by his successor in the fifth and the fourth century, but it was sure. He won it by much clear thinking. Concluding what could be done and what could not be done, he strove to perfect the one and did not trouble about the other. He was even willing, when the exigencies of the case demanded it, to give up his own better understanding. An excellent instance of this is found in the treatment of the hands in the "Apollo" statues. As long as the arms and hands of these statues were actually attached to the sides, except for a space near the elbows, the natural continuation of the lines of the forearms were the thumbs. They were therefore carved lying close to the leg. But this gave rise to the problem of disposing of the fingers. The most natural thing was to make a closed fist of the hand. In such a case, however, as every one can see by trying the experiment, either the last joints of the thumb and forefinger project, or, if the tips of the thumb and forefinger are

brought together, several angles result in the fist instead of a small triangle. The latter alternative was very undesirable because of the great space which would have to be cut out between the thumb and the forefinger, so that the hand, according to the early notions, would have lacked in stability; while the other possibility, of the projecting joints, was for technical reasons equally distasteful to the artist. The only way out of this difficulty was for him to carve an inaccurate hand. He joined thumb and forefinger at the tips, and made of the thumb the hypotenuse of a small triangle, the apex of which was the knuckle of the forefinger. Was the artist satisfied with this device? Not a whit; for as soon as he knew a different solution he adopted it. It came to him in the natural development of his skill. When in the "Apollo" of Tenea, page 80, he detached the entire arm from the body, and even removed the thumbs from the side, leaving only a thin connecting ridge, he not only had found the space for the projecting joint of the forefinger, but also had learned that marble has sufficient coherence to permit the detachment of such small parts. Up to the "Apollo" of Tenea *all* the statues show the inaccurate hands; after him they cannot be found in a single one.

It is useless to point out all such details by which the very gradual progress of early Greek sculpture can be followed. There are the arms, the hands, the heads; for they also at first had to be supported. How was

it possible that the thin column of the neck could hold up the heavy weight of the head! The hair, therefore, hung down the neck, long and loose. This is still the case in the Tenean statue. In the Strangford "Apollo" it is taken up so that the head rests proudly on the neck without any outside support. This advance in skill was made before the fashion of the youths had changed to trimming their hair short. This "Apollo" is represented with long hair done up in tresses and taken up to be fastened about his head.

Growth of Accurate Conceptions

Together with the growing skill, an advance in accuracy of conception can be noted. The body of a man at first consisted for the Greeks largely of its outlines, which enclosed a few indistinct masses. Later the mental images of the people, sharpened by expression, took in more of the peculiar quality of these masses, which are not of uniform consistency but contain flesh and bone. In the "Apollo" of Orchomenos, Pl. IV, Fig. 4, which is in many ways still very crude, the abdominal muscles below the skin are distinctly felt. The first great improvement is seen in the "Apollo" of Tenea. His breasts, thighs, and calves are wonderful creations for a man who did not yet dare to do away with the support of the hair for the head; and the knees are little short of marvelous. The trunk itself, to be sure, is still an unshapen mass, reminding

one not improperly of the "Hera" of Samos. All this is changed in the Strangford "Apollo," Pl. IV, Fig. 2. Here the muscles over the ribs are felt with a distinctness which almost tempts a curious touch to count them, and that, in spite of the fact that they are far from accurate, as even the most casual comparison with a living model can teach.

The anatomy of all the "Apollos" is faulty. The earliest are designed only for a front view. The sides and back are merely the necessary accompaniment of the execution in the round, and simply the crudest endeavors are made to join them with the front to a whole. Gradually they are treated with more distinctness. In the "Apollo" of Tenea four views are carefully wrought,—the front, the back, and the two sides. But they are only *put* together, and do not, as is the case in nature, *grow* together. The Strangford "Apollo" is really the first statue *in the round* deserving the name, even in its most modest application; for he also is designed for the straight front plane. It is a difficult task to imagine a real body of three dimensions in full freedom of action in unlimited space. The early Greek artists had not advanced to this stage, luckily for them; for the future showed that it took two more centuries of incessant activity before Greek skill had learned to grapple with this problem.

The Pose of the "Apollo" Statues

The "Apollos" are often called *standing* figures. They are, however, doubtless imagined as walking. Only in walking is the muscle over the knee as prominent as it is carved by the early artists, and as it is best seen in the Tenean figure. When one is at rest the muscle is all but unnoticed. The military step begins with the left, and practically all Europeans even to-day take the first step with this foot. These "Apollos," therefore, are probably represented as beginning to walk. When Polykleitos, a century later, carved a walking figure in progress, Pl. XXII, Fig. I, he advanced the right leg, perhaps in order to show that his athlete was not taking his first step. Both feet in walking are never firmly planted on the ground at the same time, as is the case with these statues. The "Apollo" artists, of course, did not dare to be accurate in this respect. It was bold enough to support the whole figure on only two thin legs; these at least would have to form substantial props. With a great deal of unwillingness, therefore, we may be sure they made this additional allowance to the heaviness of their material and to their own failing skill.

In a very awkward way of walking, it is true, one may manage to keep both feet on the ground simultaneously for an instant. This was the style, it has been suggested, that the ancients, feeling unable to do justice

to the other, chose to represent. To believe this is to credit the early Greeks with a more accurate observation of nature than seems to have been theirs. It is much more probable that the muscles prominent over both knees were due to the haziness of their notions. They knew that in walking these muscles are used, and had not learned from observation that they are put into play alternately. This probably is the correct explanation, although there is still another, which is based on a peculiarity of representation sometimes noticed on vase paintings, where successive movements are represented as simultaneous. In walking both muscles would eventually be put in use,—the left in the step actually represented, the right in the step to be imagined. In order to assist the imagination of this step, which could not actually be shown, the muscle of the right leg was prominently introduced before its proper time for action had arrived. Which one of these several ideas was in the mind of the artists, it is impossible to determine. Whatever it was, the attempt to show a walking figure rather than a standing one seems to account for the peculiar inaccuracies in the anatomy of the "Apollo" statues.

THE PROBLEM OF MOTION IN SCULPTURE

This is in keeping with the observation that our mental images of living bodies are less generally concerned with them at rest than in motion, either moving

through space, with the lower limbs put into play, or gesticulating, with the arms actively engaged. The material itself of which the figures are carved is stationary, motionless; so that the difficult problem arises, — how to express thoughts that the material does not permit to be represented. Before the sculptors advanced to a clear understanding of this proposition they had to learn by experience that there are no ways of actually representing motion, — that it can only be suggested. The early Greeks, it seems, were still hoping for a different solution. They were the slaves of the material, many possibilities of which they still had to discover. Motion they apparently believed to be one of them. Attempt after attempt, therefore, was made, each one improving on the preceding, but every one falling short of success, until the real solution came to the Greeks in a way entirely different from that which they had expected.

THE FLYING FIGURE FROM DELOS

One of the most interesting attempts at rapid movement is found in a flying figure from Delos, Pl. v, Fig. 1, erroneously called the Nike of Delos. The statue probably commemorates the somewhat Oriental conception of the winged Artemis, the sister of the patron god of Delos, Apollo. In later times this goddess was thought of without wings, and since Nike, the goddess of victory, and Eros, the god of love, were the

only Greek gods which continued to be represented with wings, the early statues of Artemis and those of Nike were often confused.

Not far from the place where the Delian statue was discovered, a broken base was found containing, if properly restored, the names of Mikkiades and Archermos, two sculptors of the old traditional school of Chios. The statue and the base, contrary to popular notion, do not belong together. Their peculiar shapes, however, seem to indicate that the base once contained a statue of much the same design as the extant figure. This, taken together with an ancient passage in which Archermos is credited with having been perhaps the first to represent Nike winged, may be understood to mean that the Archermos type of statue is preserved in the Delian figure.

Though badly broken, the statue is readily restored. The lines of the right leg are apparent, and those of the left can be made out from the fracture. The goddess was practically kneeling on the left knee, with the lower half of the leg projecting at a right angle. The drapery continued below the body, forming the material support of the statue, while the body itself, by this means raised from the base, was thought of as swinging in mid air; only the toes of the left foot probably touched the base. The half-kneeling position of the figure is in keeping with extant vase paintings and reliefs, where rapid movement, generally running, is

similarly represented. The artists had noticed that in running the legs are bent more at the knee than in walking, and had remembered this peculiarity, utterly disregarding its merely momentary occurrence. The French figure of speech, "to take one's legs under one's arms," *prendre les jambes sous les bras*, is based on much the same observation. This particular statue was not running, but was flying; wings, therefore, now almost completely lost, were attached on the shoulders—both on the back and over the breast—and at the feet. The left arm was bent almost at right angles to conform to the action of the legs, as can be seen from the preserved upper arm and the hand. The position of the right arm is less certain; perhaps it followed the direction of the outstretched wings to the right.

The twist of the figure at the waist is an indication of the inaccuracy of the artist's conception. For technical reasons he designed the legs in profile and the face *en face*. To the easy connection, however, which in nature exists between the upper and the lower halves of the body, he was unable to do justice, putting the two parts of his statue together, irrespective of the natural curves of actual life.

The tightly fitting garment, revealing the fullness of the female body, was originally elaborately decorated in colors. On the statue itself this can even now be seen, because the different layers of paint have left their traces in slight differences of corrosion. Another

gorgeous pattern probably ran down the broad stripe of the drapery between the legs. Similar stripes occur on the better preserved figures from Athens, Pl. VIII, Fig. 3, which have retained their elaborate decoration. The spare treatment of the garment over the breasts, in its present colorless state, may suggest that the artist here had been thinking of the nude. This is, however, not the case, as a comparison of this part with the wonderful treatment of the muscular nude right leg conclusively proves.

The conception of this leg is another allowance made to the idea of rapid motion. Many Greek garments were open on one side, so that in running the leg was apt to become visible. The same motive was used about a century later by Paionios in his Nike for Olympia, Pl. V, Fig. 3.

The crude twist of the body and the reference to Archermos, who until the discovery of the statue was believed to be one of the half mythical and therefore very old sculptors, are responsible for the almost universal mistake of dating this figure early in the sixth century, — that is, almost contemporaneous with the earliest "Apollos." The very daring conception, however, of a flying figure in stone, and the advanced skill in grappling with its representation suggest a later date. This becomes a certainty when one compares the hair of this figure with that of the series of statues from the Akropolis, Pl. IX, Figs. 3, 4, Pl. VIII, Figs. 1, 2, 3, and

page 144. The latest of them, it is generally conceded, is about contemporaneous with the Persian wars, while the earlier may have been made during the reign of Peisistratos (560-527 B.C.). Three braids falling over the shoulder is the rule with most of them, four braids only with the later; and while the hair over the forehead is at first arranged in parallel rows, it gradually becomes of greater variety, until toward the end of the series it sometimes loses all semblance of hair and curls, and is arranged in spirals, Pl. IX, Fig. 3. It would be wrong to draw definite conclusions, from a comparison of the Delian figure with the Akropolis statues, as to its exact date; the styles are too different. But when the sculptors all over Greece were working toward the same goal, such correspondences as are found in the carving of fantastic spirals rather than of at least seemingly correct curls, cannot be overlooked. None of the Akropolis figures exhibiting them are dated much before 500 B.C. The artists on the islands may have begun earlier or later than the Athenians to *imitate* existing works rather than to carve their own conceptions, but no one will believe that they anticipated them by fully a century. The generally accepted date for the figure from Delos, therefore, early in the sixth century, is untenable.

The flying "Artemis," instead of being one of the earliest attempts at sculpture in the round, belongs more probably to the end of this first period of historic

Greek art. One is astonished at the skill of the artist and at the daring of his conception. Let a wave of enthusiastic love for freedom in the spiritual and the material world, such as broke in Greece after the Persian wars, sweep over the country, and the successors of the Delian artist are transformed into the forerunners of Pheidias.

CHAPTER XIII

THE FIRST ATTEMPTS: IN RELIEF

Some assert, but without sufficient proof, that relief sculpture in the evolution of art holds the intermediate place between painting and sculpture in the round. The child playing with his paint box may readily be imagined to have acquired some facility in drawing and painting before he feels the inclination, or the need, of giving corporeal forms to the creations of his fancy; but it is a question whether he will be ahead of the little girl of whom Ruskin writes, who, left alone with some dough in her mother's kitchen, made of it not pastry, as she was expected to do, but cats and mice. The extant monuments of early Greek art are insufficient to permit a definite statement in this respect, nor is such a statement at all necessary; for whatever the origin of relief sculpture was, in the hands of the Greeks it soon became a very distinct mode of art expression. Attempt after attempt was made, until the artists finally realized what they could do in relief and what they properly could not do. But in this field of sculpture, as in the other, they did not advance to the clear perception of its possibilities until their horizon had widened after the Persian wars.

The very earliest reliefs show the same struggle with the obstinate material and the human form that was noticed in the round. In the action of the figures, to be sure, they permitted greater freedom, because an extended arm, for instance, or a flower held in the hand, can be attached to the background without the seeming danger of having them break off. More telling gestures and better poses of rapidly walking figures, therefore, are seen on reliefs than in works in the round belonging to the same stage of progress. Relief sculpture, on the other hand, presented some difficulties unknown in statues; for the grouping of the figures and the technique of carving them on different planes had to be studied.

THE SPARTAN TOMBSTONES

One of the several ways in which the artists tried to solve these problems may be seen in a series of reliefs from the neighborhood of Sparta, which show strong mutual resemblances, and sufficient differences from other known works to allow their being grouped together. They doubtless had some relation to funeral rites, and are therefore known as the Spartan tombstones. A man or hero, perhaps the dead, is sitting on a finely carved throne on one of these tombstones, Pl. I, Fig. 3. He is benignly looking at the spectator. The very unnatural twist of his head, since neither his body nor his drapery is a copy from nature, is less

noticeable than was the corresponding twist at the waist of the winged figure from Delos, whose body exhibited, in every other way, a far more delicate conception of nature. The folds on the Spartan relief, which are, when analyzed, no folds at all, are yet represented with so much confident *naïveté* that they are almost convincing. The same is true of the rest of the composition. The right shoulder of the man hardly deserves that name, and the legs, if broken off from below the knees to the ankles, could not be recognized as such.

Back of the man, perhaps on the same throne but more likely on a separate chair, which is not carved but is left to the imagination, his wife is represented entirely in profile. Having thought of her as farther away from the spectator, the early artist, unacquainted with the principles of relief sculpture, felt obliged to carve her on a more remote plane. The same he did with most parts of his composition, so that seven different planes may be distinguished. The man's head and right arm are carved on the front plane, his body on a second plane, his left arm on one still farther removed, and so on to the left arm of his wife. The composition, however, in spite of the careful differentiation of planes, is not convincing; for, owing to the comparative flatness of the relief, the artist was unable to give to each one of his seven planes the thickness required by nature; so that the insufficient shadows

which one plane casts upon the other betray the inaccuracy of the whole. It was failures like these that taught the Greeks. As a matter of fact only few reliefs in this mistaken technique are extant.

From the peculiar appearance of the several planes, sharply separated the one from the other, many have concluded that this block showed the effect of a technique of wood carving; this is, however, by no means certain. The different planes are more probably due to the endeavor of the artist to put into practice his own mistaken theories of relief sculpture.

From the point of view of grouping this relief teaches the lesson that even the early artists dreaded empty spaces. The size of the cup is entirely out of proportion to the man who holds it, and his left arm is elongated and his hand overlarge to fill what otherwise would have been an empty space.

The lines of the composition are very pleasing, carrying the eye readily over the entire block without any waste of energy. The furniture is beautiful, the lion's legs carved on the back of the throne being well able to serve as models for the most refined design. The faces of the figures, unreal though they are (notice the eyes, and the roundness of the chin on the man), are in lines and masses decidedly pleasant. It is not difficult to see that the artist believed in giving pleasure to the eye without in any way forgetting his duty to appeal to the higher faculties of man. The modesty of the woman,

just on the point of drawing her veil (once painted) over her head, and the attentive readiness of the hero, who does not lean back in his chair but as if in welcome is sitting erect, are well conceived and expressed. The two little figures of worshipers who are approaching with their offerings are clearly and simply introduced. In delineation, however, they are far below the cock which one of them carries.

KNOWLEDGE OF PERSPECTIVE

The very small size of these figures is generally explained as indicative of their insignificance as mortals compared with the deified dead. This is of course possible, but such a representation in stone is, to say the least, rare in Greece. The tendency of having all the heads of the figures on the same level militated against it, and the mortals who advance toward the seated gods on the "Harpy" tomb, Pl. VI, Figs. 1 to 4, are drawn across the entire height of the block. The small figures in the Spartan tombstone, moreover, are carved on the farthest planes, and not only on a higher level than the feet of the man for whom their gifts are meant but also themselves uneven in height. The questions, therefore, present themselves: Had this early artist definite ideas about perspective? Are these figures drawn on different levels and smaller than the rest because they are imagined as approaching from the distance? And are they themselves of different sizes

because they are thought of as the one back of the other?

Perspective was better known in Greece than its absence in extant masterpieces has led people to suppose. There are sufficient references in literature to prove its existence in painting. Early in the fifth century some of the tragedies of Aischylos were produced with painted stage scenery, which of course is incredible without the artist's making some use of linear perspective. The absence of perspective in Greek sculpture, therefore, is due not to the lack of knowledge of it but to the wise understanding that in sculpture it is out of place. The artist of the Spartan tombstone, proud perhaps of a discovery, may have endeavored to introduce it. It was unsuccessful, and doomed, like the artist's receding planes, to disappear.

PRINCIPLE OF SUGGESTION UNKNOWN

One more deduction can be made from this relief as to the understanding or the misunderstanding by this artist of the principles of sculpture. Below the man's right arm the woman's right hand is carved, perhaps to reveal the pomegranate that she held in it. But her hand does not belong here. We cannot see a hand without having it suggest the lines of the arm or the shoulder. The suggestion here is wrong because it disagrees with those lines of the shoulder that are indicated by the head and the neck of the woman. This

confusion the artist could easily have avoided, if he had been aware of the importance of suggested lines, by giving the hand a different position. The present position therefore indicates that the artist was not familiar with the principle of suggestion.

It may have been the lack of success of this and similar reliefs that kept the early Greeks from grappling with problems which were clearly too difficult for them. Few artists, therefore, selected subjects which necessitated the doubling up of figures. Most of the early reliefs, both high and low, were confined to compositions developing in only one plane. This lessened the technical difficulties and allowed the artist to bestow his entire attention on the grouping of his figures and their composition in lines and masses. A fairly early attempt in this direction is found on the slabs which once decorated the four sides of a tomb near Xanthos in Lycia.

THE "HARPY" MONUMENT

The frieze, Pl. VI, Figs. 1 and 2, of this tomb encircled the pillar-shaped monument at a height of about sixteen feet. It did not tell a continuous story, as is the case on the Parthenon, but depicted four apparently independent scenes to correspond to the four sides of the monument. On the corners of the shorter north and south sides fantastic figures, half birds half women, with

little creatures in their human arms, are introduced. They have given to the tomb the name of "Harpy" monument; for when it was first discovered the attempt was made to explain them according to the mythology of the mainland of Greece, where only the Sirens and the Harpies were known to have been thus represented. Neither of them, however, can be meant here, for the Sirens are songsters luring their victims from afar by the sweetness of their voices, and the Harpies are grasping spirits of filthy and unkind habits. The birds on this tomb are gentle spirits; they have taken the little ones kindly in their arms and are apparently well liked by them. This is seen in the welcoming and endearing gestures of the men or women they hold. Greek sculpture is very expressive, and gestures are apt to have their definite meaning. A similar gesture of affection and welcome is seen on a tombstone, Pl. I, Fig. 4 (once called the Ino-Leukothea relief), where the baby is approaching her mother.

These birds, carved on a tomb, with an apparently mourning figure introduced below one of them on the north side, are probably representations of the spirit of death. Perhaps they are the inventions of the artist and not stable characters of folklore; for on another Lycian tomb, a century later, other fanciful creatures were represented,—the "Nereids," so called because they are seen easily skipping over the water. There is doubtless as little direct connection between death

and the "Nereids" as between it and the birds. Both "Nereids" and birds may have been introduced as concrete representations of the abstract idea of death coming swiftly, snatching man away from his surroundings and continuing irretrievably on its preordained pathway. For the ancients death had few horrors, appearing to be a kind spirit, the brother of sleep, the Healer. This may explain the happy gestures of the little figures which the birds are carrying away. The size of these figures, which has been called ridiculously small, appears so only when it is compared with that of the people in the main composition. The artist apparently held that it would be possible to look at every part of his reliefs separately.

THE PICTORIAL ELEMENT

In the chief groups the Lycian sculptor set himself a simple task; in the four corner pieces he was more ambitious. He wanted one to imagine unlimited space in which the birds were moving with outspread wings and inclined bodies. The birds are seen soaring in the air, and below a lonely figure is mourning. Such a theme is too complex for sculpture, which can never do it justice. The painter may touch on things above and below; the sculptor, dealing in corporeal realities, must confine himself to the tangible. It cannot be denied that in this instance the Greek sculptor (Lycia for all practical purposes of art was Greek) has scored

a fair success. His successors, nevertheless, realizing that in these groups the proper sphere of sculpture was transgressed, refrained from going farther in this direction. The *pictorial* element in the best Greek reliefs is absent, not because the Greeks had not yet "advanced to conceive of it" but because they had found it, *after* experimenting with it, unsuited to the best practices of their art.

THE POSE EXPRESSIVE OF CHARACTER

The remaining groups of these reliefs consist of seated figures receiving offerings or granting favors. The attitudes of the seated figures seem to be expressive of character, just as they are on the Parthenon frieze, where Zeus or Athena is picked out with little difficulty, and where it is due only to the present insufficient knowledge of the characteristics of the other gods that one fails to recognize all. The same is true of these reliefs. We do not know the Lycian Pantheon, but a Lycian, no doubt, was familiar with the bearded man of full proportions and careless, self-indulgent demeanor on the east side, or the straight, dainty goddesses in their kind but almost haughty attitude on the west. The appropriateness of the several interesting animals is to us as little clear as that of the seated figures. The cock in the hands of the boy vies in telling contours with the cock on the Spartan tombstone; and the pig under one of the thrones, and especially

the sucking calf over the little opening, are remarkable instances of animal sculpture.

The chief interest, however, attaches to the human figures. Their heads, with the exception of that of the boy who offers the cock, are all, whether the people sit or stand, on practically the same level. The resulting incongruity of such a representation is cleverly disguised by having the seated figures apparently represent gods, who with propriety might exhibit superhuman proportions. The different sizes of the figures, therefore, do not impress one as entirely due to the restrictions of isokephalism, as was the case in Assos, Pl. II, Fig. 2, but to some extent as required and explained by the composition. The artist is beginning to be master over his material! He shows this also in the treatment of the three women on the west side. The ease with which the folds of their garments are carved and the textures of their dresses are distinguished, or their gestures made expressive, and their bodies designed to show through their closely pulled garments, is admirable notwithstanding their poor state of preservation. In the drapery, however, the artist gives signs of the customary ignorance of the principle of suggested lines. No drapery, not even the Greek, can cling to the body so closely as it is here shown, especially not if it is heavy enough to fall in such prominent folds. The back contours of these women, notably those of the one nearest to the goddess to the

right, reveal, like those of the "Hera" of Samos, almost every line of the nude body; while in front, owing to the heavy folds, only the breasts are prominently seen; the rest is — suggested. This, however, is only an accident. It probably came as a surprise to the artist himself, though it may eventually have taught him the valuable lesson of suggested lines.

APPLICATION OF SUGGESTED LINES; RELIEFS FROM THASOS

One of the first successful attempts in this new direction is a relief from Thasos, Pl. VII, Figs. 1-3, now in the Louvre. Its comparatively poor state of preservation, and more especially the unfavorable light under which it is exhibited in Paris, account for the neglect with which it has been treated in spite of the fact that it exhibits some of the most beautiful figures created before the Persian wars. The relief was probably designed to decorate the entrance of a sacred cave, for it contains two inscriptions in early characters referring to sacrificial rites. Another later inscription, of about the second century A.D., indicates that a gentleman of the name of Aristokrates appropriated the slabs for the decoration of his tomb.

The relief consists of three slabs, of which the two smaller, it seems, ought to be joined one to either side of the larger. The composition is divided into two independent parts. From the left Apollo and the nymphs



HERMES AND "GRACE" FROM THASOS
(Louvre)

are advancing toward the open door, and from the right Hermes and probably the graces. In the inscriptions all are mentioned by name except Hermes, who is recognized by his attitude and by his costume. The muses, who in later times always appear as the nine companions of Apollo, were originally nymphs without a fixed number. There are not nine nymphs represented here, and it may even be doubtful which ones of the figures are the nymphs and which ones are the graces; for the traditional number of three for the latter also belongs to a younger age. If there was an attempt at character differentiation between the two sets of goddesses, it was so slight that it is no longer appreciable.

THE GROUPING OF FIGURES

The artist bestowed his chief attention upon the grouping of his figures and their modeling. Five figures are seen on either side of the door, but they are subdivided into smaller groups of three and two of inverse correspondence; for whereas the group of two is nearest the center on the left, it is on the right the farthest away from it. On both sides one male and one female figure are seen, but variety is introduced by having once the man and once the woman supply the livelier lines of the design. A similar attempt at variety can be seen in the corresponding groups of three women each. Variety here was especially difficult because the sculptor felt obliged to carve all the

women as slowly advancing with modest steps. Since the lines of their bodies, therefore, could not supply him with the desired motive of differentiation, he naturally sought it in their draperies. And this led to a deviation from the customary way of carving the draped figure; for the fuller garments of the women on the left required a design according to the principle of suggested lines. A comparison with the "grace" back of Hermes, page 134, where the sculptor closely adhered to the earlier practice of actually carving the lines of the body under the drapery, shows the effort it doubtless cost him to break with the traditional rendering of the human form. Nothing but the necessity of introducing variety in an otherwise well-balanced composition could have persuaded him to try a new mode of execution. He was remarkably successful. By delicately indicating a few prominent parts of the bodies, he suggested all; and what is more, he never suggested lines in one part contradicting the suggested lines of other parts, as was the case on the Spartan tombstone. The rendering of the human form in this new style implies a much more accurate conception of it than is required for the complete delineation of all its contours, because in cases where the lines actually meet the correction of impressions that are too faulty is inevitable.

THE OLD AND THE NEW WAY OF REPRESENTING THE
FIGURE

These three figures, it is true, cannot compare in charm with the woman crowning Apollo or the "grace" following Hermes, both of whom are carved at least in part in the older style. But in the progress of Greek sculpture they hold a more important place. They show of what the new mode of rendering the draped figure is capable, and give promises of great success. The two other figures, on the contrary, in spite of their wonderful charm, clearly show the limitations of a style which had been conscientiously adhered to from the first in the hope that its perfection would bring the solution of all the difficult problems. Now, when it was developed, it was seen to be incorrect and was therefore doomed to disappear. The Greeks, however, did not find it easy to do away with *actually seeing* the nude carved below the drapery. After another century, when the new style was in its prime, means were again invented to satisfy this need of the people, and the entire body of draped figures was revealed by subtle suggestion to an extent unequaled even by the most radical attempts of the earlier sculptors.

The beauty of the girls immediately following the gods is evident. The eagerness and proud happiness of the nymph crowning Apollo show in every line of her body. Her form is carved in a way to bring out

the wonderful restraint which does not allow excited haste to disturb the contour of her graceful figure. The "grace" back of Hermes is entirely different but not less winsome. Her breast is rendered with perhaps too much fullness. On the whole, nevertheless, one's eyes glide over her figure with remarkable ease. The artist, it seems, bestowed his most loving care upon these two girls. It is therefore especially unfortunate that they are less well preserved than the others. None, however, are slighted. All reveal touches of delicacy and give proof both of the knowledge and the diligence of the artist.

APOLLO AND HERMES

What is true of the women is equally true of the men. They are wonderfully sympathetic creations of sculpture. Apollo is the god of sunshine, beauty, and music. He has been advancing toward the door (as can be seen from the direction of his left foot) but has suddenly heard the nymph behind him. He has stopped and half turned toward her. His head is badly damaged, but he seems to be glancing over his shoulder at the girl. Checking his onward movement, he leans back, with his left leg still bent at the knee. The resulting twist of his body is splendidly conceived, and rendered with marked simplicity in the new (suggestive) style; for the full drapery of the god compelled the artist to break loose from the old traditions. How

many attempts had intervened between this Apollo and the winged figure from Delos, Pl. V, Fig. 1, it is impossible to determine, because neither of them can be dated with accuracy; allowing, however, the greatest possible space of time to have elapsed between their creations, and granting even the early date of the Delian statue, they still come within two, or less likely three, short generations. It is even possible that they are much nearer each other; for the twist of the "Artemis" in the round made greater demands on the skill of the artist than that of the Apollo on the relief.

The drapery of Apollo is a study in itself. For the first time the folds are not rigid, as the material of which they are carved; they fall easily, and with the appearance of softness, even readiness to obey the least impulse of a contrary breeze. Only the chiton below the upper garment is designed in the traditional way of parallel folds.

Hermes wears a peculiar garment, the traveler's cape or *chlamys*, which hardly appears in early sculpture. It is therefore much cruder in appearance than Apollo's *himation*, and is on the left arm carved with the same parallel lines that can be noticed on a crude statue representing Chares, which dates about 540 B.C. In front, however, the folds show a freedom not unlike that of the garment of Apollo.

In spite of his small cape, Hermes, Pl. VII, Fig. 3, is really conceived in contrast to the draped Apollo as

the nude figure of the composition. Compared with the early nude figures, his gestures and his stride are freer, because of the ease with which an extended arm and a bold step are carved in relief. His features too and the pose of his head are more successful. In general conception, however, he is not unlike the "Apollo" of Tenea. Here, as there, a few unconnected parts of the body are distinctly felt and carefully modeled, though not growing together in a natural way. In the Tenean figure the sculptor has made transitions by carving almost meaningless masses; here he has tried to hide their absence by the garment, with little success; for it is impossible for us to feel beneath the cape of Hermes the god's abdomen or his chest. One also vainly endeavors to imagine how the legs are joined to the trunk in the fashion suggested by the lines of the shoulders.

The extended arm is perhaps the best modeled part of the figure; it is far from rigid, though strong, and implies a kind welcome and a generous address. The different surfaces of the upper and the lower arm, and the dimpled elbow, are distinctly felt, and are rendered with a perfection not expected in a man who had so much difficulty in joining the legs to the body.

In the half-open mouth one may perhaps see a reference to Hermes Logios, "the Speaker," as the god was sometimes called. From analogy to vase paintings it is not at all unlikely that the exact words which

accompanied the addressing gesture of the god were painted near his mouth. The speaking mouth, however, was early found to be entirely out of place in sculpture; for this branch of art has nothing to do with the accidental. No gesture, however accurate, must be carved which is not primarily expressive of character. The open mouth in stone, although conceived as a *speaking* mouth, cannot fail to impress the spectator as the indication of those rather unpleasant qualities of character which are associated with people who keep their mouths open habitually. The Thasian artist introduced the open mouth to make his Hermes more lifelike. It was a mistake, since such a device is contrary to the principles of sculpture.

THE TECHNIQUE OF THE THASIAN RELIEF

Technically only the Hermes and one or two other figures show a deviation from the simple fashion of carving a relief with all the figures surrounded by an even depth of background. The round contours of the Hermes, and especially of his lifelike right arm and of his legs, are due to the play of light and shade about him, which the artist obtained by cutting away more or less of the background. The artist was on the right way, following which the Parthenon sculptors solved practically all the problems of relief sculpture; but being one of the pioneers, he was not entirely successful. He forgot, in the first place, to disguise his

devices from the spectator; even in the photograph the uneven grooves above the extended arm and about the legs can be seen. It is, however, one of the fundamental principles of art not to show the means by which an illusion is obtained, for the spectator's readiness to be deceived is in keeping with his dislike of having it pointed out to him that he has been misled.

It was the introduction of a new technique which made use of shadows that prevented the Thasian sculptor from doing justice to his figures. In the legs of Hermes he was especially unsuccessful. If one looks only at the feet, it is not difficult to suppose that the right foot was farther away than the left; but if one looks at the knees, and sees the edge of the cloak lie there as close to the left as it does to the right, while it throws a distinct shadow on the background between them, one cannot help imagining both legs to be on the same plane. This is, in a position like that of Hermes, impossible. By relieving the cloak sharply against the right leg, and allowing it to throw a prominent shadow on this leg, the semblance of an accurate production would have been saved. This of course would have meant carving the right leg, from the ankle to the hip, gradually receding into the background; for only thus could the cape be strongly relieved from the knee. Such a device was in constant use with the Parthenon sculptors. To the earlier artist, however, it seemed to

do too much violence to his conception,—if it at all occurred to him.

This Thasian relief, then, exhibits a remarkable mixture of the old and the new, both in technique and in general design. The old had been pushed to its perfection, and its limitations had been recognized. The new was tentatively and, it seems, almost unwillingly introduced; for the conservative adherence to tradition was a prominent characteristic of the Greeks before the Persian wars. Only after the barbarians had broken the almost sacred relics of the past, and after the Greeks had been freed, not alone politically from the threatening danger of the Orientals but also morally and intellectually from all kinds of real or imagined restrictions,—when in short their horizon had begun to widen,—was the new, which really exhibited nothing but the rational outgrowth of the old, recognized at its true worth, and developed with a rapidity before which the advance of the earlier and more conservative masters was bound to appear all but tardy.

CHAPTER XIV

CONSERVATISM ; READY SKILL BEFORE FREEDOM OF CONCEPTION

If a complete set of statues antedating the Persian wars were in existence, one could probably trace from it the tenacity with which the early Greeks clung to the traditional way of rendering the human form. The sculptors were ready to improve upon the attainments of their predecessors, but unwilling to push their efforts in new directions. No complete set of statues is in existence. Few pieces of good workmanship are preserved, and these, although numerous enough to give weight to the above assertion, could not prove it unless they were supplemented by a series of old statues from Athens showing the gradual advance of sculpture there during a period of almost a century. The majority of these statues are of Athenian origin, so that in using them in this connection one runs the danger of confusing the tendencies of a local school with the large principles governing the whole of Greece. This danger is avoided if one keeps in mind that the Athenian figures are not intended to carry the burden of the proof but simply to illustrate what appears to be fairly established by other monuments.



AKROPOLIS FIGURE
(Athens)



During the excavations on the Akropolis of Athens from 1885 to 1891, when every cubic foot of soil was turned over, some thirty draped female figures were found. They had been broken by the Persians in 480 B.C., and had been buried by the Athenians after the successful battle of Salamis, perhaps in order to serve, together with other *rubbish*, for the broadening of the level surface of the Akropolis. For twenty-three centuries they lay undisturbed in the dry soil on top of the living rock, and escaped the utter destruction and oblivion which overtook most of the contemporaneous sculpture. Not even Roman copies of works of this period are extant; for the Roman taste did not appreciate the earliest attempts of the Greeks.

When first discovered these figures showed many traces of painting, and thus served to strengthen the argument of the coloring of ancient statuary. All of them are of marble. They represent unknown women. Athena images, although dedicated on her sacred precinct, they can hardly be; for not one of them contains any of her attributes,—helmet, spear, snake, or ægis. It is now generally believed they are priestesses of Athena; but nowhere in literature is a custom referred to by which these priestesses were allowed to have their statues dedicated either at the end of their term of office or during the performance of their duty. Such a custom is, however, known from Argos, the seat of the famous temple of Hera.

The Akropolis statues, whether priestesses or simply Athenian maidens, seem to have been erected at intervals during a period of sixty years or more, the latest perhaps in the very year of the Persian attack, the earliest surely not before the time when Peisistratos had himself firmly established in Athens. This is proved not only by a comparison of the statues with an Athena excavated at the same time, which formed part of the pedimental decorations of a large temple built by Peisistratos, but also by the fact that many pieces in soft stone from the same excavation antedate the marble figures as clearly as they are, in part at least, later than the crude works of about 600 B.C. and the following decades.

The entire series has recently been classified from several points of view, and although it is impossible to distinguish in every case the earlier from the later, no doubts can be entertained as to those figures which mark the very beginning and those which form the end of the series.

One of the earliest, Pl. VIII, Fig. 1, is in conception not unlike the "Apollo" statues. The breast is carved with characteristic fullness and inaccuracy, both in position and in shape. Below the breast the body appears in indefinite masses. Even the outlines are mistaken, for the lines from the shoulders, along the waist to the hips, and down the legs, show a very hazy

conception of the actual contours of a woman. Like the "Apollo" figures this statue was carved under the restrictions which the shape of the block and the weight of its material imposed. The arms, though detached below the shoulders, were not far removed from the body; for the sculptor did not dare to separate them by more than a narrow opening. This explains the comparatively straight lines of the body, which were only dimly felt by the artist, and which, therefore, readily assumed the easiest direction suggested by the now lost arms. The lines are not in the least due to the fact that the figure was draped; for though the garment was heavy enough to fall in prominent folds in front, it was all but suppressed wherever any part of the body was to be shown which the sculptor had clearly conceived. This is especially well seen on the breast, where the artist relied entirely upon the addition of paint to show the drapery. About the legs the garment is tightly stretched, revealing slight folds not dissimilar to those on the cape of the Hermes from Thasos, page 134.

The pose of the figure is erect but rather neutral, less indicative of the character of this particular woman than of that of the type to which she belongs. The head rests tall and proud upon a straight neck, the great thickness of which, necessary for technical reasons, is somewhat disguised by the braids falling over the shoulders.

The features are prominent, and rendered with the simplicity of a man who has not yet learned to read in them more than their actual shape implies. The treatment of the eyebrow is especially interesting. The artist apparently had a definite idea of the distance between the brow and the eyeball, but he converted the distance of depth into one of height, perhaps because it was difficult to render it properly, but more likely because of the haziness of his memory image. The result was an apparently bulging eye, the more so since the treatment of the eyelids offered the same difficulty as the brow. The upper and the lower eyelids are curved in opposite directions, but without any feeling for their characteristic differences in shape and substance. The same is true of the lips; for the lower lip is only the inverted upper lip, or vice versa.

The entire figure seems to be the fairly accurate rendering of a primitive artist's hazy conception of a female body. Nowhere do we feel that the artist was conscious of his lack of skill. He realized the restrictions of the material in which he worked and submitted to them cheerfully because his conceptions were sufficiently hazy to be readily adapted to any contingencies. In the case of the broad neck designed to support the heavy head, and cleverly disguised by the braids, we may perhaps even find an indication of satisfaction on the part of the sculptor with his own work. There is an inscription extant of an artist from Naxos who worked at about

the same time, and who was so well satisfied with his own creation, Pl. III, Fig. 2, faulty though it now appears, that he wrote under it "Alxenor of Naxos made me. Just look at me!" We do not know what was written on the base of this figure, but we should not be astonished to find there too the expression of self-approbation.

With every successive attempt the sculptors of this series show that they have advanced both in skill and in clearness of conception. Their memory images of the body have become somewhat more distinct, their conceptions of the enveloping drapery have grown, and their skill has kept pace with the general advance.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE DRAPERY UPON THE TREATMENT OF THE NUDE

The drapery in all these figures is of prime importance, but the sculptors would not have been Greek if they had not been interested in the nude. They bestowed, therefore, their most loving care upon the only visible nude part,—the face. The face in Greek sculpture, on the whole, is but one of many interesting parts of the body, and entitled only to its proportionate amount of care. The Akropolis sculptors, on the contrary, felt obliged, it seems, to express in the face all that their contemporaries who worked in the nude, and their successors who were more skillful in the treatment of the drapery, told by means of the entire body.

This was the more necessary for them to do, since the pose for their statues was apparently prescribed: all stand with one leg advanced, holding the drapery up daintily in one hand. The artists had to grapple, therefore, with the entirely un-Greek problem of facial expression, and that at a time when the full meaning of a countenance revealing character was unknown. Viewed in this light the exaggeration of the features to which the sculptors resorted is as little surprising as their inability to convey a definite meaning. Facial expression with them did not spring from the innate desire to put the soul in the face,—indeed, the very word *ψυχή*, “soul,” in its spiritual meaning was unknown to them. It was rather the result of their mistaken endeavor to solve a technical problem.

The great attention given to the faces of these figures is equaled only by the care bestowed upon their elaborate draperies. Unable at first to represent well the fullness of the garment shrouding a beautifully developed body, and dissatisfied with taking such liberties with it as the sculptor of one of the first figures, Pl. VIII, Fig. 1, had done, the artists drifted in the direction of carving the drapery for itself. And this again influenced the entire design of the figures. Sharp angles in the human body are unpleasant because indicative of poor development; in a piece of cloth they are less out of place, and often even very acceptable. When this was noticed they were believed to add piquancy

to a work and were therefore no longer confined to the drapery but introduced also in the face. Some sculptors went so far in this direction that their figures, Pl. VIII, Fig. 3, may be said to lack completely straight lines and right angles. The brow is acutely arched, the eyes are slanting inward toward the nose, and the difficult problem of the mouth is solved by carving the lips also in a sharp curve. Not all the sculptors, however, were carried away by this fad of the sharp curve and the oblique angle. Several heads, page 144, and Pl. IX, Fig. 4, belonging to this series are simple and straightforward. They have on that account been assigned to the Doric school of sculpture, which some credit with these characteristics. The close intercourse, however, that existed between the different art centers in Greece from the earliest time, and the ready exchange of ideas everywhere and more especially in Olympia and in Delphi, where works from all over Greece could be seen, and where Dorians and Ionians alike met for days in succession during the frequent national games, indicate that the sculptors of the more dainty figures in the angular style were familiar with the practice of other schools. These several heads, therefore, instead of being the work of foreign artists, may show the voluntary reaction of some of the Athenians who themselves had begun to realize the mistake into which the loving care of the drapery had driven them.

COMPARISON OF SOME OF THE EARLIER AND LATER
AKROPOLIS FIGURES

Even the study of a few of these figures illustrates these several points. In the figure on Pl. VIII, Fig. 2, the sculptor has conceived more clearly than his predecessor his task of carving a draped figure. The line of the left side is here not unlike the line of the earlier figure, Pl. VIII, Fig. 1; but while there it was meant to represent the actual contour of the body, it is here, in part at least, explained by the folds of the garment. The breast, which on the other figure was carved with such prominence as to overlook the fact that the woman was draped, is here treated with so much moderation that it is almost unnoticed. The drapery has become the all-important part, and the breasts, lest they detract from the drapery, are hidden below the braids. This is in strong contrast to the earlier statue, where the sculptor had carried the braids to the sides in order to have the breasts seen. No clearer indication could be given of the change which the conception of the artist had undergone. The earlier sculptor conceived his task to be the carving of a human figure which happened to be draped; the later sculptor endeavored to show the drapery which happened to be worn by a woman. The beautiful patterns which are preserved on some of these statues seem to indicate that these women wore their festal robes. It is possible, therefore, that the

ladies who are here represented insisted upon the careful representation of their garments, even at the cost of having their bodies slighted.

The faces of the two statues singled out for comparison also show marked differences not only in their outlines but also in the treatment of details. The later sculptor, for instance, had a far clearer conception of the several integral parts of the eye. He carefully and clearly differentiated between the upper and the lower lids, and carved the upper lid, perhaps in the first pleasure of having noticed its length, entire, ignorant as yet of the possibility of suggesting its whole extent, even if it was rolled up. He made a great mistake, and certainly laid himself open to misinterpretation, for there are people who under given conditions drop their upper lids without entirely closing their eyes. And since in their case we are apt to read either their habitual character or their momentary state of mind in their eyes, we cannot help doing the same with the early Athenian statues. If, on the other hand, the sculptor really wanted to express character, which in the absence of individuality in his figure is hardly likely to have been the case, he was not successful. His exaggeration made that impossible. It is more probable that he carved the upper lids in their entire extent for no other reason than that he was striving to express accurately his mental image of the eye and its surroundings.

THE TREATMENT OF THE MOUTH

The mouth is perhaps the best part of the statue. The lips are straight, but full of delicate modulations, running off easily into the cheeks. It is a refined and beautiful mouth, treated without the exaggeration common to most of the statues, which is the more remarkable since the mouth offered great difficulties to the sculptors from the beginning. The straight cut across, with the abrupt termination as it appears on one of the oldest heads of Hera from Olympia, Pl. IX, Fig. 1, and also already on the golden mask of a bearded warrior from Mycenæ, proved unsatisfactory at an early date. A bronze head from the Akropolis, Pl. IX, Fig. 2, and the head on Pl. VIII, Fig. 1, show the next step, with the line between the lips straight across, and the lips arching almost evenly above and below. A straight line of this kind is unsatisfactory in the profile view, where it seems to form an unpleasant angle with the lines of the jaw. The mouth, therefore, was carved slanting down from the corners. This, however, necessitated a peculiar treatment of the line joining the two corners of the mouth. The easiest way was to carve a simple curve. It is seen in the majority of heads antedating the Persian wars. The curve was more pleasant to look upon than the straight cut across, but it was not less radically different from nature. Writers on Greek sculpture, struck by the peculiarity of this curve, have

termed it the "archaic smile." This is a misnomer, because the Greeks did not resort to it with the intention of carving a smiling expression. Far from it! The curve was the result of a technical difficulty. In Athens it fitted in well with the tendencies of some local sculptors, who developed it and exploited it a great deal. The majority of the Greek artists, however, were never entirely satisfied with it, and strove incessantly to reach a more pleasing rendering of their conceptions of the human mouth.

Two very interesting experiments are found among the Akropolis figures. The lower lip (head, page 144), is treated much like the lip on the bronze head, Pl. IX, Fig. 2, with the upper edge straight for the front view and the lower edge in a drooping curve from the corners to agree with the line of the jaw in the profile view. The upper lip is broken up in two curves, which are joined in the center and form what is called a "cupid's bow." It is a great improvement over the single curve, but in effect not yet altogether pleasing. The next artist went a step farther, and on his figure, Pl. IX, Fig. 4, each one of the two curves of the upper lip is again broken up in two. The result of this is an extremely delicate mouth. By following this hint of breaking the lip up into several parts, the sculptor of the figure, Pl. VIII, Fig. 2, which formed the starting point of this discussion, succeeded in carving a most exquisite mouth.

LACK OF SINCERITY

The simplicity of this figure is in strong contrast with the lack of it in one of the latest statues of this series. The latter figure, Pl. VIII, Fig. 3, though extremely delicate in treatment, shows the tendency of angular lines and sharp curves to an unpleasant degree. And what is more, it indicates that the artist who made it was no longer sincere in the representation of his conceptions. He copied the technique of his predecessors. The corkscrew curls which take the place of braids are well done, but they are carved *exactly* like the upper fold of the outer garment,—the artist did not feel the quality of the objects he carved. The same probably is true of the eyes, and of the spirals in which the locks terminate over the forehead.

If the sculptor had been left free to reproduce his ideas as he conceived them, he might have carved an entirely different figure; but for some reason he was obliged to design the statue of this woman in the identical way in which all her predecessors had been represented. To have her statue carved in this old honored way seems to have been the desire and the prerogative of every one of these ladies. Who, indeed, we may ask, would have been bold enough to break with this custom, and have her statue carved in a new style to conform with the more accomplished skill and the more correct ideas of the artists? Only after all these statues had


been destroyed by the Persians and been buried by the Athenians, did the artists and their patrons dare to start along a new road.

The latest statues of this series are extremely suggestive of what might have become of Greek sculpture if it had lacked the awakening and liberating influence which followed upon the victory over the barbarians. The skill of the artists had grown, but their conceptions had not been permitted to find adequate expressions in new directions. One has only to compare the over-elaboration of Pl. VIII, Fig. 3, or the fanciful spirals which take the place of hair in Pl. IX, Fig. 3, with the earliest creations of the Akropolis series, to see the danger of fossilization of ideas which had begun to threaten the sculptors. In some of the statues, on the other hand, there are indications of vigor and sincerity. It is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that the Greeks would perhaps have been able to retrieve themselves even without the stimulus that came with the Persian wars.

CHAPTER XV

BROKEN FETTERS: A PERIOD OF TRANSITION

The Persian wars mark a turning point in the development of the Greek race. When Xerxes gathered his enormous army to reduce the continental Greeks, it seemed as if all the dim dread of barbaric and unconquerable chaos was to become a reality. All the energy of the last centuries had been spent in vain, for the cloud had gathered which threatened to sweep into oblivion the ideals for whose realization the best men had labored. When a storm of this kind breaks, the nation goes down, unless it is upheld by the accumulated energy of its past achievements. Nations in this respect are like individuals whose conquest over adversities depends "on the degree of moral strength into which their hearts have been already trained." The Greeks did overcome the Persians; chaos was not unconquerable; the cause of right and light and progress had shown its power to triumph over apparently unsurmountable obstacles. There is nothing impossible for him who has the strength of faith; there are no arbitrary bounds either in the material or in the spiritual world which, if they hinder the vigorous advance of right activities, cannot be broken down. With this



ARISTOGEITON (Naples)

From Brunn-Arndt, Pl. 326



realization there comes a joyful spirit of freedom; no longer a mere mortal bound by meshes of uncontrollable fate, one feels the divine part within one and knows how to partake of limitless possibilities, as is the right of gods. When the Greeks took their seats at the oars and rowed up the Bay of Salamis, when the Persians' countless ships were routed and the hostile army fled, then the people began to know what men can do, if to do they dare and will. When the Athenians returned to their city and found her in ruins and at once set out to rebuild her, then they had learned the lesson that "though right be worsted, wrong can never triumph."

A spirit of freedom, in consequence, took hold of the Greeks in every department of life. Their literature echoes it, their philosophy builds on it, and their art expresses it. Freedom and daring alike of conception and of execution are immediately noticeable; the old is no longer followed because it is venerable: it is weighed and retained if it is good, or discarded and forgotten if it is found to be the lifeless inheritance of the past.

The momentum acquired by the entire race after the Persian wars is such that one wonders less at the broken fetters than at the moderate use which is made of the newly gained freedom. To take the straight and narrow path in a closely circumscribed life is a much slighter achievement than to follow the proper direction

unwaveringly when all the bounds are broken down. But this the Greek sculptors did; they never looked on their freedom as a licentious relief from laws of any kind, but as a right to choose the best. They did not succumb to a reckless spirit of innovation, nor advance by bounds and leaps, nor break completely with the past. They built upon the best achievements of their predecessors, discarding only such restrictions as the earlier artists had permitted to grow up arbitrarily and hamper the best expression of their ideas.

All restrictions under such a mode of procedure cannot disappear at once. The first thirty years after the Persian wars are a period of transition. Few works, unfortunately, are preserved of its activity, and of the sculptors who lead up to Pheidias little is accurately known. Three men, however, stand out prominently, each one marking a definite achievement in the art of sculpture, — Myron, Pythagoras, and Kalamis. Their work is linked to the past by its affinity to the creations of two other men, Kritios and Nesiotes, who were the sculptors of one of the most famous groups of antiquity, reproducing a still older type.

THE LINK WITH THE PAST: THE TYRANNICIDE GROUP

When Xerxes sacked Athens and ordered most of the temples and the statues broken, he took such delight in a bronze group commemorating Harmodios and Aristogeiton that he decreed its preservation and carried it

away with him to Persia. This was the more remarkable since these youths had been the assassins of Hipparchos, one of the sons of Peisistratos and a brother of Hippias, who had accompanied Xerxes on his campaign against Greece. By this murder they had been the cause of the downfall of the monarchy in Athens. The Athenians, in their turn, forgetful of the fact that it was personal spite and hatred which had actuated the deed, and looking upon the tyrannicides as the vindicators of their liberty, had ordered their statues made by Antenor, probably soon after 510 B.C. And again, immediately upon their return to Athens after the battle of Salamis (480 B.C.), the Athenians, unwilling to be without their tyrant-slayers, commissioned Kritios and Nesiotes to erect a new group. Antenor, it seems, was dead, and these two sculptors, since little else is known of them, may have been his pupils, or even his assistants when he made the original group.

By means of several copies on coins, vases, and reliefs, two figures in Naples, Pl. V, Fig. 2, and page 158, of later Roman workmanship have been recognized as life-sized copies of the Tyrannicide groups. For many years it was doubtful whether the earlier or the later group was preserved in these statues, but a recent and as yet unpublished acquisition of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts seems to decide definitely in favor of the later group. But even if this conclusion is correct, it is wrong to see nothing in these figures of the earlier

style, because doubtless they were made to look as much like the Antenor statues as possible. For this reason they may well be said to form the connecting link between Greek sculpture before and after the Persian wars.

The originals were of bronze, and did not need the tree trunks by which the Roman copyist, who translated them in marble, has retarded their action. Copious restorations moreover, partly wrong, have altered the appearance of the statues to their great disadvantage.

THE RESTORATION OF ANCIENT STATUES

There is something to be said in favor of restoring ancient figures, and the average visitor to the museums is right when he prefers to look upon entire men and women. But he must not forget that when the figure is restored he is no longer looking at a piece of genuine Greek or Roman workmanship. The restorer, because he had not much to guide him, has often taken liberties. When, for instance, as in the present case, both arms and one leg of the Harmodios statue, and the head and several other parts of the Aristogeiton were lost, how could he, with his slight knowledge of the antique, know how the ancient sculptor had planned them? Restorations, therefore, had better not be made on the originals. They may, however, safely and advantageously be introduced in casts, where there is no difficulty in changing them if they are found to be wrong.

The restorations of the Tyrannicides have by recent comparisons with coins, vases, etc., been shown to be very inaccurate. This is especially true of the arms of Harmodios. The restorer believed these figures to be gladiators fighting one another. The gestures of Aristogeiton are aggressive; Harmodios was, therefore, restored as on the defensive. This is wrong; for both men are represented as advancing against a common foe. By restoring the right arm of Harmodios sharply bent over his head and ready to strike, the statue gains in unity and in power; for every line of the body is indicative of aggressive onward movement. Of the legs sufficient fragments were left to show that their restorations are substantially correct.

HARMODIOS AND ARISTOGEITON

Harmodios is rushing upon the tyrant, who has insulted his sister. His step is quick and impetuous. The muscles, ever ready in an active body, have responded to the call of the emotions. His face, however, is treated with such simplicity that it carries for the modern taste even too little of the feeling which is surging through his body, and under which his chest is thrown out with great impetuosity. In Harmodios there is a touch of sublime honesty as he is pushing forward at the side of his older friend. Aristogeiton, too, is full of firm resolve, but somewhat lacking in enthusiasm. His step is less quick and springy, almost

halting, perhaps to show that he is aware of the awfulness of his purpose. His body is more firmly knit, and shows, if compared with that of Harmodios, the older man. Such age differentiation is a departure from the earlier practice. In the "Apollo" statues one is never tempted to ask, How old is he? The "Apollo" is merely a grown-up man, *any* man, without a definite character or a definite age. Not so the Tyrannicides; for both Harmodios and Aristogeiton have a distinct, though not clearly circumscribed, character and a definite age. The head of Aristogeiton is unfortunately lost; the present head of the statue does not belong to it, for it is a copy of a type which was evolved nearly a century later. The original head was bearded, as appears from copies on vase paintings.

The freedom of action in these figures is remarkable if one realizes that it belongs in design, if not in execution, to Antenor in the last decade of the sixth century. It is in marked contrast to the constrained movement even of the latest "Apollons." But they were of heavy marble, while these figures were of bronze, a material which offered fewer difficulties. The Tyrannicides, therefore, ought to be compared with reliefs rather than with marble statues in the round; and then it is not difficult to find analogies for such freedom, for instance in the boy offering the cock on the "Harpy" tomb, Pl. VI, Fig. 3, or the Hermes from Thasos, page 134. The Naples group,

nevertheless, surpasses even these figures in daring of conception, and herein probably shows the improvements which Kritios and Nesiotes introduced in the original design.

One of the most hopeless tasks confronting the earliest artists was the problem of rapid movement through space, because they all were trying to solve it by actual representation rather than, as was done later, by suggestion. The Tyrannicides may be said to hold an intermediate position between these two modes; for the inclination of the body of Aristogeiton, page 158, and his outstretched hand and far-extended right leg clearly indicate the step he is to take next. His pose, however, is one of momentary rest between his long and halting steps, and not one of movement. There is great muscular tension in the upper part of his body; but with his legs gone it would be impossible to determine whether this was due to the exertion of walking or to any other expression of energy, as, for instance, the leaning forward to deal a blow from a standing position. This latter, of course, was the interpretation which the restorer gave of the pose of Aristogeiton.

REFLEX ACTION

In vehement action it is not only the legs and the arms thrown out and the lines of the torso curved, but every part of the body, reflecting the controlling energy, that tells the story. As long as a sculptor conceives of

the prominent parts of his figures as put together instead of grown together, thinking of bodies the members of which he may raise or lower—the material permitting—as he does with a jointed doll, he cannot carve a figure that will seem to live. Only when he advances to the understanding of the human body as one complete, closely knit, integral unit, and is enabled so to represent it, has he begun to lay hold of life itself. Raise your arm slowly, and the reflex action upon the rest of the body is unnoticeably slight; deal a vigorous blow, and at once the strength of the gesture can be told by the changes that accompany it in other parts of the body. The actual lines of the arm carved may be the same in both cases. Their meaning, however, differs according to the amount of vehemence suggested by the rest of the body.

Myron was the first sculptor who clearly understood these principles and began to do justice to them in his statues. For the Romans he was the sculptor of life *par excellence*; his statues were imbued with *anima*, the spirit of life, which distinguishes the animal world from inanimate nature. *Animus*, however, that is the soul, which is the characteristic part of man as compared with beasts, he did not know. The first step of the Greeks had been to distinguish the visible outlines and masses of human beings from other things; the next step was to feel the difference between man and inanimate matter. In this direction Myron was the leader.

The third step was still to be taken, and consisted in the appreciation of that side of man, commonly called his nobler self, by which he is linked to the gods.

THE STATUES OF MYRON

How utterly Myron missed in his statues this side of man, and how he bestowed all his attention upon the "breath of life," is proven by his most famous statue, portraying—a cow. She seemed to live; and many anecdotes were told of the hardships of the herdsmen who had to drive their cattle through the place where she stood. The animals, mistaking her for one of their own kind, stolidly refused to leave her company. It was her *life* that was admired. The same was the case with the most famous statue of a man by Myron,—his Ladas. Ladas was an Olympic victor who had paid his life for the crown. He died from exhaustion immediately after crossing the line.

The bronze statue which Myron made of him has long since disappeared, without leaving as much as a copy. Some ancient epigrams, however, enable us to form an idea of the conception of the figure. Translated they read:

Just as thou wast, O living, breathing Ladas,
When thou didst race the fleeting breath of life
On thy tiptoes with every muscle strained;
Just thus the artist Myron fashioned thee in bronze,
And stamped on thy whole frame
The eager yearning for the crown that Pisa gives.


Or again:

Full of expectant hope he is, while on his very lips
The last breath lingers that has left his hollow flanks.
Now, now the bronze will leap to seize the crown;
The base no longer holds him back.
Indeed this art is swifter than the wind!


Of two other statues by Myron Roman copies are extant. They, too, having been designed in bronze, have lost in the marble much of the swiftness that could only be caught in bronze.

THE DISCUS THROWER

The Discus Thrower is known in three life-sized and several smaller replicas, of which a small bronze in Munich, although of inferior workmanship, approximates more nearly than the others the light pose of the original. The most accurate copy is said to be a marble in the Lancelotti Palace in Rome, which, however, is so anxiously guarded from visitors (in the fear of being proved a forgery?), and which is known only from such poor photographs, that a final verdict of its value is impossible. If genuine, it is the only life-sized copy of the statue by Myron that has preserved the head in its proper position, looking back toward the hand with the discus. On the other two important statues, in London, page 168, and in the Vatican at Rome, the heads are wrongly restored.



DISCUS THROWER AFTER MYRON
(British Museum)



The actual method of throwing the discus in antiquity is not definitely known. Some believe that this athlete will hurl his weapon in the direction of his right foot, while others believe that he will make a few quick steps and then wheel about to send the weapon back of him. Whatever he will do, his present position is instantaneous; he has assumed it by swift muscular contraction, and will leave it by equally swift extension. This shows one of the chief excellences of the art of Myron, which was to catch momentary poses, preceded and followed by rapid motion. The spirit of life surging through the figure suggests the rapidity of movement which is to follow, and indicates the swift contraction that had preceded. The statue in this respect is far ahead of the Aristogeiton. Like him, however, it does not attempt to portray the movement itself. The relation, in fact, of the two figures is even more intimate than appears at first; for, if one compares them, one sees how naturally the conception of the one grew from that of the other. And, what is even more noticeable, both figures, in spite of their twist, are designed for one definite plane.

THE MARSYAS

The same is true of the Marsyas by Myron. The restorer overlooked this fact. Finding the statue with broken arms, and thinking of some later Roman representations of dancing fauns or satyrs, he supplied the

torso with bent arms and castanets. These additions are suggestive of rhythmical turning and swaying movements, in utter disagreement with the rest of the body; Marsyas, Pl. X, Fig. 2, is simply recoiling,

Like a man who has seen a snake and then darteth backward.

Athena, so the story goes, had invented the pipes (flutes), but seeing her inflated cheeks reflected in a brook, she had thrown them away. Marsyas thereupon had stealthily crept up behind her, ready to seize the instruments in the hope of announcing them as his own invention. Just as he stooped to pick them up, Athena turned in wrath, and Marsyas recoiled. This is the moment represented by Myron. The next instant Marsyas will collect himself and dart away. It is, therefore, again the moment of instantaneous rest between rapid movements that supplied the motive.

MODERATION

Both the Discus Thrower and the Marsyas give proofs of another noteworthy characteristic of Myron,—his extreme moderation. The youth with the discus could easily turn a little more to his right, or bend slightly more in his knees, or raise his arm still higher, and gain thereby in apparent strength. He would lose, however, one of his greatest charms,—the charm of reserved force. One may do a thing ever so well, but if one shows that one has come to the end of one's

resources the charm of perfection is gone; for the ease with which a thing is done is the surest promise of still greater accomplishments.

The head of Marsyas is an interesting study, showing that Myron here, in strong contrast to his predecessors, endeavored to depict the national characteristics of the race to which his man belonged. Marsyas was a demi-savage, with long, un-Greek beard and moustache and cunning *Mongolian* eyes.

The heads of the Discus Thrower statues are perhaps the least interesting parts, for attention is centered in the twist of the body,—that is to say, the action. The hair of the head is simply blocked out, without verisimilitude to nature, and the features fail to show even their appropriate amount of physical energy. The same is true of the other outlying parts of the body, except perhaps the feet, which grasp the ground with remarkable force.

PLINY'S VERDICT OF MYRON

On the whole, one is not astonished to hear Pliny sum up what he has to say of Myron in these words: "He appears to have been the first and foremost sculptor to extend the province of lifelike representation in art, . . . yet he, too, expended his care on the physical aspect of the body, and did not represent the accompanying sensations of the mind, nor did he show any

improvement from the rude practices of early art in the treatment of the hair."

It is, therefore, the vigor and comparative freedom of his conception which entitle Myron to be ranked as the foremost artist of the transitional period, rather than his technical skill or neatness of workmanship. In these latter directions the advance was heralded by two other men, Pythagoras and Kalamis. Very little is definitely known of them, and although Dr. Waldstein has made it more than probable that the type of a statue known as the "Apollo with the Omphalos," Pl. XI, Fig. 1, goes back to Pythagoras, and others are ready to assign to Kalamis the magnificent statue of a charioteer recently discovered in Delphi, Pl. XI, Fig. 2, both attributions are still open to doubt.

PYTHAGORAS; TELLING USE OF DETAILS

The argument of Dr. Waldstein, especially when rearranged and strengthened, is so interesting and gives such an excellent insight in the treatment of such discussions that it cannot be overlooked. In substance it is to the effect that the statues copying the type which goes under the name of the "Apollo with the Omphalos" are statues of a boxer.

Victor statues did not always show the athletes engaged in the sport in which they had won, a fact which compelled the sculptors to distinguish them by means of their physical development. The best

trained muscles of a runner are in his legs, and those of a boxer in the upper part of his body. The shoulders and upper arms of this "Apollo" type are so splendidly developed, and the blood courses in them so freely in large veins, that they attract immediate attention. They convey the idea that this man put the muscles of the upper part of his body more habitually in use than any other; in other words, that he was a boxer. The Roman copy, moreover, of this type in the British Museum, Pl. XI, Fig. 3, contains on the tree trunk an oblong object which cannot be, as has often been erroneously asserted, a broken bow, and which may be a leather thong such as boxers in ancient times used in the place of the modern glove. If this interpretation is correct, it proves that the Roman copyist at least understood the original to represent an athlete. The style of the statue unmistakably assigns it to the period of transition. The most famous boxer statue of this period, however, was made by Pythagoras. That a famous work is copied in these "Apollo with the Omphalos" statues cannot be doubted, since fragments of a great many are extant. They *may* therefore go back to Pythagoras. This tentative attribution, finally, of the original statue to Pythagoras gains much in probability when it is learned from the verdict of the ancients that the telling use of veins was the great force of this artist. Pythagoras was also praised for his care in the treatment of the hair; and of all the statues

of this period none show such delicate locks and such well-arranged hair, treated ornamentally in itself, as these particular statues.

These, in short, are Dr. Waldstein's arguments in favor of assigning this "Apollo" type to Pythagoras. And it must be conceded that he has made out a stronger case than often appears in similar attempts. Even the attribution of the Discus Thrower to Myron cannot be said to rest on better grounds.

GRACE AND DELICATE WORKMANSHIP; KALAMIS

Very different from the achievements of Myron and Pythagoras, both of whom worked almost exclusively in the nude, was the contribution which Kalamis made to the art of sculpture. He was most highly praised for the "comely arrangement and the order of the drapery" of one of his figures, whose "nameless grace" and "noble and unconscious smile" also are mentioned, and thus appears to be the worthy successor to the sculptors of the draped Akropolis *ladies*. None of his many other works has received a careful description, although his horses are singled out as remarkably good. It is perhaps no mere accident that we hear of the cow of Myron and the horses of Kalamis. The cow is not an especially worthy subject in itself; it is the spirit of life with which Myron imbued her, that made of her a work of art. The horse, on the other hand, is the noblest animal of creation, next to man,

and would naturally appeal to Kalamis, whose strong point was not the instilling of the spirit of life but the nobility of treatment which added to his figures "that nameless grace." It was coupled, to be sure, as Cicero says,—and this need not surprise one considering the early date of the artist,—with a certain severity.

The Greeks and Romans liked Kalamis well; and it is therefore especially unfortunate that it has not yet become possible to identify definitely any extant statue with his work. Even the recently discovered Charioteer of Delphi, Pl. XI, Fig. 2, whom Homolle would assign to Kalamis, cannot be claimed for him without grave doubts. All that can be said is that the Charioteer exhibits a style not incompatible with what is known of the style of Kalamis.

THE CHARIOTEER OF DELPHI

The Charioteer was discovered during the French excavations in Delphi, in 1896, and at once found its way to popular favor. Spare and simple in treatment, he is yet full of dignity. The modeling of the nude, especially in the preserved right arm, is exquisite. In the face a certain severity is felt, which once probably was moderated by the expression of the inlaid eyes. The dimensions of the large nose and the long chin carry definite reminders of earlier works, most of which exhibit similarly liberal proportions. The feet are very

well done, although they do not look so in existing photographs. The hair on the top of the head, where it could not be seen, is flat, while the locks on the temples continuing down the cheeks as the first growth of a beard are well conceived and neatly executed. The drapery is grand in its simplicity, while the threatened monotony of its long, deep, parallel folds is relieved by the constant play of light and shade as on a fluted column. It is perhaps this resemblance to a column that gives the figure its unwonted appearance of stability.

In appreciating the Charioteer, however, it must never be forgotten that he was only a part of a group; for sufficient fragments have been found to show that he once stood in a chariot drawn by several horses, and that he was accompanied by at least one other figure.

The entire monument was dedicated—according to the discovered inscription—by Polykallos, the younger brother of the tyrants of Syracuse, and dates from about 475 B.C. Only the legs of some of the horses are extant, and it is of course impossible to draw definite conclusions from them; they show, however, the simplicity of treatment and the accuracy of observation noted in the Charioteer. The base of the monument was cut of local stone, while the monument itself was without any doubt cast at one of the great art centers of Greece or lower Italy.

Whether there were many art centers besides the few in Greece, and in Rhegium in Italy where Pythagoras worked, we do not know. Tradition in this respect is scant. The achievements, however, of the three decades after the Persian wars, habitually gathered about a trio of great men, are so tremendous that they would seem to be the result of the joint work of many minds. The principle of suggestion was followed, character and age differentiations were introduced, the meaning of reflex action was understood, moderation was practiced, while the details of the composition were carefully executed and used with telling exactness. It is upon these combined achievements that subsequent artists built their successes. But even without them the earlier artists had started toward the goal which they had dimly conceived but never been able to reach.

CHAPTER XVI

SCULPTURED TEMPLE DECORATIONS

In the gradual advance of Greek sculpture one branch was destined to play a prominent part,—the decoration of temples. The oldest Greek temple of the familiar classic shape is the Heraion in Olympia, which is now in ruins, having left no definite traces of sculptured decorations. Some of the earliest remains of that kind were found on the Akropolis of Athens, and date from the beginning and the middle of the sixth century. They were carved in brown local soft stone (*poros*) and were completely covered with paint. Almost all of them were used to decorate the triangular gables of temples, called pediments, Pl. XII, Fig. 1, and offer valuable indications of the care with which already in the earliest times the sculptors endeavored to adapt their compositions to the peculiar shape of the space which they were to fill. Very few are well enough preserved to allow a detailed study both of their execution and their conception. The most interesting is one of the heads of a three-bodied monster, the Typhon, Pl. XIV, Fig. 3, whose hair is blue and whose eyes are green. The color in this case, therefore, was merely applied to differentiate the several parts of the head,



WARRIOR FROM AIGINA
(Munich)



with no attempt to approximate natural semblance. This, however, was probably not the universal practice of later times, for it was here merely resorted to as a means of adding to the monstrosity of the Typhon.

The treatment of the eye and of the brow is extremely interesting, because it offers a better suggestion of the actual condition of the artistic conceptions of the time than the contemporaneous and subsequent marble sculptures, where the more difficult technique often prevented the artist from correctly expressing his ideas. Tufa, on the other hand, is very readily carved, and offers no obstacles, or at least very slight ones. The characteristic differences of the upper and lower lids are not felt, while the depth of the eye below the brow is to some extent understood. The ear also, with its intricate volutes, is far ahead of many marble sculptures before the Persian wars.

The Typhon was designed to fill one half of a pediment. His three bodies, therefore, gradually diminished in height, ending in tapering coils of snakes. Snakes can assume almost any shape without seeming violence to their appearance, and are therefore favorite subjects for early pedimental decorations. In another fragment from the Akropolis the hundred-headed Hydra, which Herakles was sent to kill, fills one half of the composition, while Iolaos and the chariot fill perhaps the greater part of the other half. Almost four centuries

later Greek sculptors again resorted to the representation of coils of snakes when they were obliged to decorate the approach to the great altar at Pergamon which was cut up by a row of steps.

RESTRICTIONS OF LARGE PEDIMENTAL COMPOSITIONS

When the temples began to be larger, and more figures had to be introduced, the problem of how to fill the triangular pediments presented itself again more urgently and in a more complex form. The pediment was preëminently an important architectural part; the horizontal appearance of its floor had to be preserved at all cost, so the figures were not to be raised on different levels, as that would have detracted from the essential straightness of the line above the columns. The roof was slanting from the center toward the corners, which made it impossible to design the figures of equal heights. Human figures, however,—and it is they which the Greeks at all times preferred,—are all of about the same size, a fact which made it necessary to account for differences in height by differences in position rather than in size. The positions of the figures, therefore, were, within certain limits, prescribed, and unless the artist was willing to appear as the slave of the space, he had to design his composition so that the kneeling or reclining figures of his groups were explained by the central idea controlling his composition. They were not permitted to appear to be due to their

accidental location nearer to or farther away from the center.

Another difficulty was due to the fact that a pediment, which is one complete unit in itself, requires one united composition for its decoration. Moreover, it does not permit a continuous story to be told from left to right or vice versa, because the architectural center line, to which and from which everything tends, is absolute. The attempt to cross the center slightly has at times been successful, but the story never can continue over to the other corner without doing great violence to the architectural design. This of course compelled the artist to arrange his composition in two sharply divided halves which yet were to form one whole. And here again, of course, the great artist would desire to have the division of his composition appear to be the natural outcome of his conception, and by no means dependent on outside considerations. No sculptors before the Parthenon can be said to have been entirely successful, and even in the Parthenon it is perhaps only the east pediment which is satisfactory.

The pedimental compositions of two large temples antedating the Parthenon are known at the present day. Those from Aigina were excavated in 1811 and are now in Munich; they were restored under the supervision of the Danish sculptor Thorwaldsen, and have received a few additions from more recent excavations; those from the large temple of Zeus at Olympia were found during

the German excavations (1875-1881) and are preserved unrestored in a museum built near the spot.

THE TEMPLE OF AIGINA

The exact date of the great temple on the rocky coast of the island of Aigina is unknown. On account of its pretentious dimensions and of the style of its architectural and sculptural decorations it can hardly antedate the Persian wars. Nor can it be later than between 470 and 460 B.C., for by that time the fierce struggle between Aigina and Athens had begun which ended in Aigina's annexation by her great rival and the complete loss of her national independence. Even the deity to whom the temple was dedicated is not definitely known. Perhaps it was Athena, who appears as the central figure on both pediments, but more likely a local and not generally known goddess, Aphaia, whose name in important inscriptions was found by Professor Furtwängler in his recent excavations of one and two years ago, and whose temple is mentioned by Pausanias.

Only the fragments of the west pediment were sufficiently well preserved to allow of a complete restoration, Pl. XII, Fig. 1. Later finds, however, have shown that slight changes in the arrangement of the figures must be made. A few more ought to be introduced, so that there will be fourteen in all. This brings the warriors in closer touch with one another, and adds to the idea of a confused battle scene without complicating the lines

unpleasantly for the spectator. The subject appears to be very well chosen, for a battle scene is naturally divided in halves. The fallen warrior in the center, whom both friends and foes are endeavoring to pull over to safety or to destruction, forms the connecting link. The attention of the beholder is centered in him, especially as he is seen lying at the feet of the goddess Athena.

The introduction of Athena to fill the large center space is less satisfactory, because, being motionless, she is foreign to the general idea of the composition. Standing in the very middle between the armies, the goddess does not even indicate where the victory will be. Nor has the artist been successful in the arrangement of the battle scene itself and the grouping of the men. The kneeling postures of the bowmen are natural enough, but the men back of them, or according to the new arrangement in front of them, who are fighting with long spears, are too obviously crouching because the slanting roof did not permit them to stand erect as did the other spearmen nearer the center. They have, moreover, no definite opponents, because the strict division of the warriors into two hostile camps made that impossible. The subject of a well-arranged battle is therefore, after all, not the best for a pedimental decoration. The wounded warriors farthest from the *mêlée* are well introduced as lying in the corners; and because they *naturally* belong there, they make the spectator

completely forget the limitation of the space under which they are carved.

For the discussion of the several figures it is better to turn to the east pediment, where more careful and skillful modeling is shown. In every other respect the two pediments are identical. They contain the same number of figures in the same positions. This is extremely rare in sculpture, where the Greeks generally avoided repetitions. In Aigina, however, the sculptors repeated exactly not only one pedimental group in the other, but also balanced the two halves of the composition with an almost monotonous sameness.

One of the most expressive figures of the east pediment is the fallen warrior, Pl. XIII, Fig. 1, in the left-hand corner. Neither he nor the other fallen men are represented as dead and flat on their backs (as they would probably have been represented in a painting), because at their considerable height the slightly projecting floor of the pediment would have completely hidden them. The others have simply raised themselves on their arms, so that they practically fall in the plane along which the beholders glance up at them. This warrior, however, if he were to arrest the eye, had to make one more twist in order to point his breast downward to meet the glance of the spectator. Thus he is here represented; but the constrained twist is beautifully explained by the attitude of the figure itself. The man has received his death wound,—he has fallen,—

but his indomitable will still controls his body, and he endeavors to rise. His efforts are vain. Unable to lift himself, he tries to turn over so that the strength of his arms may assist him; but even this is of little avail, and soon he will collapse.

The daring simplicity of the conception is all but incredible so soon after the Persian wars. It was, in fact, too much for the artist's skill, for he was utterly unable to represent the twist from the abdomen to the breast. He knew this, and therefore placed the right arm in a position which was designed to hide the lack of connection between these two vital parts of the body. The arm again is so well introduced, and its position so naturally explained by the composition of the figure, that one does not suspect the defects which it hides until one steps close up to the original, or the cast, and looks behind it, Pl. XIII, Fig. 2. These defects are not due to carelessness, or the thought that they cannot be seen; for all the figures, and even the back of this warrior, which was supposed to be forever invisible, are so well carved that the poor chest and abdomen here, which do not naturally grow or flow together, must be explained as due to the insufficient skill of the sculptor and his inaccurate knowledge of anatomy.

Another characteristic figure is the standing warrior, page 178, to the right of Athena. His hand is raised with the spear, his legs astride; but in spite of his pose he does not appear to be moving or to be ready

to hurl his spear. His position is not unlike that of Aristogeiton, but he lacks reflex action; he is more like a jointed doll, and entirely without the spirit of life, — without the *anima* which it was Myron's mission to teach and to exemplify. What is true of this figure is true of almost all, except the fallen warrior in the south-end corner: they are lifeless; they are not *men* but *pictures of men*. The entire composition, therefore, is unable to prove continuously interesting. The spearman will never hurl his weapon, the bowman will not shoot his arrow, and the friend will never drag the wounded into safety. And all this in spite of the greatest freedom of gestures and poses, and the complete absence of extraneous supports to mar the composition, although all the figures are carved of heavy marble. The bodies are there, but no Prometheus has as yet appeared to put life into them and to make them move.

The study of the faces is very difficult, because so many are restored wearing the same expression, and because the restorations have been so well adapted to what was left of the figures that it is almost impossible to distinguish between them. Even the corrosion of the marble surface has been artificially imitated. Of the genuinely antique faces not all are alike by any means. All the mouths, to be sure, show the curve in front, — the *archaic smile* as it is erroneously called, — but they exhibit, nevertheless, pronounced differences.

If one has once carefully studied the expression of the bowman in Asiatic garb in the south wing of the west pediment, one will never again be tempted to call the curved mouth of the wounded man in the north corner of the same pediment, as is often done, a smiling mouth. His mouth is rather expressive of great pain borne with fortitude and that reliance upon the gods which characterized the Greeks even in the hour of death.


There is a noticeable incongruity between the freedom of the male figures and the constrained representation of the goddess Athena, Pl. XV, Fig. 1. It has even been suggested that she was purposely carved in an older style in order to indicate that she was present not in person but merely as a temple image. A temple image, however, seems strangely out of place in a battle scene. The correct explanation of Athena's restrained position is probably found in the fact that the Aigina sculptors had, as we know from literature, much practice in carving nude male figures, but had almost completely neglected the representation of women. The Athena from Aigina bears some resemblance to the draped figures from the Akropolis, while the folds hanging down from her arms are not unlike those from the "Harpy" tomb. It is therefore not at all unlikely that the Aiginetan sculptors borrowed an old type somewhere for their Athena, while they designed their male figures in accordance with their own

well-developed style. They were preëminently sculptors in bronze, and the clearness of outline which that style is apt to foster shows in every one of their figures.

OLYMPIA

The Olympia figures, Pls. X, XIII-XVI, and pages 18 and 188, in strong contrast to those of Aigina, show unmistakable signs of marble technique, and are full of those delicate suggestions which the more lifelike surface of marble tempts the artist to indicate.

The evidence as to the date of the great temple of Zeus at Olympia is summed up by Mr. Robinson to the effect that it "was begun probably about the year 470, with booty taken by the Eleans in a campaign against their neighbors, the architect being Libon, a native of Elis. Just when it was finished is not known. Herodotus speaks of it as complete in 445, but it must have been finished some time before then, as we read of the Spartans placing a golden shield on the apex of the eastern pediment after a battle at Tanagra in 457." This clearly shows that the temple was built in the period of transition after the Persian wars. Pausanias, who saw the temple almost intact in the second century of our era, has left a fairly accurate description of its pedimental groups, which, though apparently not correct in every detail, has yet been of invaluable assistance in arranging the broken figures in complete groups. The subject of the east pediment related a story known



PEIRITHOÖS
(Olympia)



as the "chariot race of Pelops and Oinomaos," and the west pediment one of the "struggles of the Centaurs and Lapiths at the wedding feast of Peirithoös."

The East Pediment

The large central figure of the east gable, Pl. XIV, Figs. 1 and 4, is Zeus, whose presence is appropriate only because this is his temple, for he takes no active part in the story. As god he could be represented of larger proportions than the other people, and this is probably the chief reason why he is introduced. To his left stands the king Oinomaos, who by the treachery of his charioteer was destined to lose in this race. He was known to have perfidiously slain all the other suitors who, before Pelops, had tried to win his daughter Hippodameia by the only possible means,—a race against the king's immortal horses. The very fact that he is seen on the left side of Zeus may indicate his waning star of luck. The artist has thus turned the compulsory presence of the large central figure to good advantage.

Pelops holds the right of Zeus. He is a man of slender proportions, indicative of his greater youth compared with the older king. He is accompanied by his bride-to-be, whose mother stands on the other side close to Oinomaos. These five figures, which form the central group, are satisfactory by themselves; for gods are naturally larger than men, and men taller than

women. The different heights of the figures, therefore, do not appear to be due to any limitation of space. Considered as a part of the entire composition, this central group is nevertheless unsuccessful. To the right and left of the women the pediment was narrowing down too much to admit more standing figures, so that the charioteers and the grooms, who naturally would be standing, had to be introduced in crouching or in kneeling positions. This gives to the two corner groups an aspect of musing restfulness entirely out of keeping with the central figures, whose standing attitudes are suggestive of impending activity. The entire composition in consequence is thus broken up into three unconnected parts, the center and the two corners, instead of containing only two parts, as the artist evidently had intended it should, — Oinomaos and Pelops with their respective retinues, — united to one whole by the presence of Zeus. The two four-horse chariots fill their allotted space well, but the reclining figures in the corners, conceived probably as spectators, are so obviously out of place that Pausanias believed they had nothing to do with the story but were symbolic representations of river gods.

The figures on the right and the left of the central god are designed with special care. The corresponding figures in Aigina balanced each other and were practically alike. Here such an identity would have been inadmissible, because these two figures are

individuals and not indefinite representatives of a class of people. The artist therefore endeavored to bring out in their poses the characteristic differences of their dispositions. The self-relying and impious Oinomaos, with head erect, half turns his shoulder upon the god, and rests his hand with fingers outspread on his hip in a nonchalant way. Pelops, on the other hand, though sure of victory, modestly bends his head in the divine presence. Oinomaos is an older man, and this the artist endeavored to show by his fuller proportions. When the artist later proceeded to view his composition as a whole, he found that the slender figure of Pelops did not well balance the heavier king on the other side. He therefore added a bronze coat of mail to the younger man, as is attested by the several holes of attachment on the shoulders and below the abdomen. This was an afterthought, as is again clearly shown by the fact that the entire front of Pelops was beautifully finished before the holes were bored, while on the Olympian figures as a whole, unlike the Aiginetan, only those parts were finished, or even at all carved, which were meant to be seen. The addition of the cuirass was an exquisite device, for it enabled the artist to attain complete balance in masses without giving up the touch of age differentiation which was offered by the slighter body of the younger man.

The two women also are well characterized by their poses and the folds of their drapery. Sterope, the

consort of the cruel king, stands straight and almost stiff, with the folds of her garment falling in long parallel masses, indicative of firmness. Hippodameia touches her hand modestly to her chin, and her garment falls in delicate folds to her feet. Another very expressive figure is the old man, Pl. XV, Fig. 2, back of the chariot of the king. The heavy wrinkles of skin under his rather fat breast, his half-bald head, and his long locks are sure signs of his advanced age, while the seriousness of his expression and his intent gaze into the distance have made people believe they saw in him a seer filled with dire forebodings of the outcome of the race.

One of the very best figures of all is the reclining youth, Pl. XIII, Fig. 3, in the north corner of the pediment, who is eagerly gazing into space. Probably thought of as one of the spectators of the coming race, he has raised himself on his elbows in order to see better, and this has given him such a magnificent curve that Pausanias had no difficulty in seeing in him a river god. Similar representations of river gods were very popular in Roman times, but it is not certain that the Greeks of the fifth century had developed their ideas far enough to embrace symbolic personifications. The twist of the body, no matter whom the figure represents, is marvelous. The same considerations which led to the carving of the dying warrior on the east pediment of Aigina may also account for the Olympian boy, who in lifelike representation is far ahead of that

older statue. There the chest and abdomen are simply *put* together; here they *grow* together in wonderfully easy and flowing masses, the very shape of one part indicating the position of the other. The head, in spite of its expressive gaze, is out of keeping with the splendid body. Perhaps the artist relied upon the addition of color; the hair, for instance, is only blocked out to receive the paint. It must, however, never be forgotten that these figures were not to be seen close at hand, and that at their considerable height details of fine modeling would have been apt to disappear. The eye, nevertheless, especially when compared with the mouth and the nose, betrays a remarkable lack of accuracy of conception.

The West Pediment

The east pediment, looked at as a whole, is in lines very quiet and restful; the actors are introduced who are to take part in the suggested tragedy, but the moment for action has not yet arrived. All this is different in the west pediment, Pl. XIV, Fig. 1, where an active struggle is going on. The peace of the wedding feast has been interrupted by the centaurs, who have snatched up the women and the boys and are making away with them. Peirithoös himself and his friend Theseus are fighting in the center, while Apollo, the patron god of the Lapiths, has appeared between them to calm the strife. In spite of his commanding gesture he takes no

active part in the struggle, and seems to have been introduced for no other reasons than accounted for the presence of Zeus in the east pediment and of Athena in Aigina. The subject of the battle scene, however, is differently treated from that on the older temple. The combatants are not divided into two hostile camps, but are mixed up, each one actually struggling with a real foe. This adds life to the composition, and shows that the sculptors understood the defects of the earlier design. The reclining figures of old women in the corners are technical necessities. Possibly they are meant to be horrified spectators, guests or attendants at the wedding feast, but they are too obviously introduced to fill the narrowing space under the slanting roof to be altogether satisfactory. The artist, however, has turned their presence to some use, for reclining on cushions, they suggest an indoor scene. In Aigina the battle was raging in the open; here the struggle has begun in the festive hall of the king. This is the reason why the centaurs are endeavoring to canter away from the center; for away from the center toward the corners is the direction which suggests the flight from the interior to the open.

The grouping of the figures is done with wonderful skill and with full understanding of the devices by which the eye is readily carried from one person to the other. The three prominent people in the center are hardly seen when the action of the youth at Apollo's right directs one's attention to the centaur whom he is

trying to slay before the beast can carry off the girl. Centaur and girl form a closely knit group, which makes it easy to glide over to the next two figures of equally close connection. Here, however, the extended arm of the boy seems to link another figure to them which, in thought, belongs to the final group of this side. The constant resolution of groups in masses into new groups, according to thought, makes it possible to view the entire composition with the rapidity that the confused battle scene demands. The movement grows ever swifter toward the corners, but even the standing figures in the center have an intimate connection with the fray, and with the more violent boys in the corners, who in the heat of combat have hurled themselves bodily upon the centaurs. By thus tackling their opponents they are brought low down to the position demanded by the slanting roof. Their attitude, however, is so well explained by their action that the spectator completely forgets the limitations of space.

All this simple and continuous movement is lost if one keeps to the original and mistaken arrangement of the figures as they were first put together. The centaurs are transposed and put nearest Apollo, with the two youths back of them. This brings the recoiling head of one of the centaurs near the outstretched hand of Apollo, who, so the advocates of this arrangement reason, by his gesture repels the beast, and therefore is no longer aimlessly present. This, however, is a

palpable mistake; for it is not the god, but the muscular strength of the arms of the woman that forces the bestial head backward. It is, moreover, impossible to believe that the centaur would continue to canter into the room and right up to the god even after he had felt the power of Apollo's hand. The youth back of him, finally, is so large that were he placed as much nearer the corner as the insertion of the centaur group between him and Apollo demanded, he would reach to the very roof of the pediment and would never appear to be able to deal his blow. Where he properly belongs, at the side of Apollo, he does not seem cramped in space; one may expect to see him bring his hatchet down at will. These are formidable objections to the old arrangement; the most prohibitive, however, is that it spoils the continuity of the design, because it breaks the entire composition into three unconnected groups, Apollo with the centaurs and the youths in the center, whence there is no transition whatsoever to the corner groups.

The large Apollo in the center, page 18, is the most impressive figure. He does not actually take part in the fray, and yet his very presence seems to suggest defeat for the beasts. By his mere gesture he dominates the fight, and reminds one of the statement of Aischylos, that "all the gods' work is effortless and calm." He was originally designed with a small cape slung over his shoulder, one end of which appeared

over his left hand. But when the artist came to look upon his figure as a part of the entire composition, he noticed that the broad shoulders of the god and his advanced leg gave him an unpleasantly wedge-shaped appearance. He therefore added several pieces below the left hand, and changed the garment so that it fell in a curve from the hand down to the feet. That this was an afterthought, just as the cuirass of Pelops was, is readily seen from the many fragments of the extended robe that have been found, and from the arrangement of the cloak on the back of the statue, which, though merely blocked out in the rough, contradicts the present design.

The figure was intended for a considerable height, and defects in modeling, as on the arms and breast, would not be noticed. Splendid though it is, it shows how far the artist was from a clear conception of the human form. The contours of the front and the back are of equal width, although even the most casual glance at a model would have shown the sculptor the inaccuracy of such a representation. The head is a magnificent piece of sculpture, to which every line of the figure carries the eye. The features are in keeping with the impression of majesty,—the lips full, the nose generous, and the eye frank and open. The orderly masses of the hair, without any pretense to natural semblance, are yet completely satisfactory; the hair is long and rolled up at the neck over a ribbon, which

originally was made of bronze, attached to the hole behind the left ear, and carried along over it in a groove. The ear is too large and tipped too far back on the head to be accurate, for in nature it is almost vertical; so that, considering the tilt of the head here, it ought to tilt slightly to the left. But like all Greek artists, this sculptor took liberties; for he cared more for the preservation of the necessary rhythm of his figure than for accuracy to nature, that is to say, *objective* nature. From this he deviated in order to make a more forceful and more pleasing appeal to the *subjective* nature of his spectators.

A splendid touch of reality he introduced in his composition by differentiating between the modes of fighting resorted to by the several persons. The men in every case are on the aggressive; even the tender boy reaches forth his hand to deal the centaur a vicious blow. The women, though physically fully as powerful as the boy, are invariably on the defensive, endeavoring to keep the most sacred parts of their bodies intact from the touch of the beast. Deidameia, the bride, who may perhaps be recognized by her full robes in the right wing of the pediment nearest Apollo, has been snatched away by the centaur, who holds her tight between his fore legs. She does not think of dealing him a blow; her only thought is to keep his voluptuous head from contact with her own. The next moment, as it were, is seen on the corresponding group on the other side,

Pl. X, Fig. 2, where the girl has released his head because he has touched her breast. She tries to remove his unholy grasp there, without, however, forgetting her first intention, for she is still warding his head off with her elbow.

On the other side, nearer the corner, another woman is also eagerly struggling to get the centaur's hand away from her breast. The centaur was galloping off with the girl on his back, when he was tackled by one of the youthful Lapiths and borne down with such power that he sunk on his knees. The woman slipped from his back, but was tightly held by her foot and the folds of her garment, and though he received his deathblow he would not release her. The corresponding group near the left-hand corner is very similar, except that the outcome seems less clear, for the Lapith is weaponless. Again the woman has slipped from the centaur's back; again she is caught, but this time by the hair. The centaur has been unable to take hold of her breast, and her only endeavor, therefore, is to keep his head away from hers. According to the old arrangement the centaurs touching the breasts of their victims are on one side, and those whose heads are kept at a distance on the other side. Such a poor distribution is surely not to be expected of a sculptor who took obvious pains to introduce variety in the balance of his figures.

The heads of the centaurs are full of bestiality, reminding one not improperly of the Marsyas of Myron.

He, however, is a decidedly more refined beast. Their faces are full of lustful expressions, which it is important to notice, because all the other faces, with one exception, are expressionless. A beast, from the Greek point of view, might lose his self-control; the noblest man, never; for he could not be conceived with the beauty of his quiet features marred by passion (cf. Peirithoös, page 188). It is wrong, therefore, to draw too definite conclusions from the absence of expression on the finest of the Olympia faces as to the skill of the artist. Changes, nevertheless, have taken place since the Aiginetan figures were carved. There one feels the echo of the old limitations in the curve of the mouth and in the lifeless eyes; here one sees, in spite of all inaccuracy, an independent rendering of much freer and clearer conceptions of the head. The features in no case are individual, and yet the figures appeal to one with the force of individuality. This is due to their action; they do not stand or move as *any* one *must* do under similar circumstances, but as their own particular feelings dictate.

The Olympia sculptors, therefore, had successfully started on the road of character suggestion by means of poses and gestures. They had advanced to the understanding of human nature and dared to express it, and had done so even before they had completely overcome all technical difficulties in rendering the human form. Neither the anatomist nor the archæ-

ologist, nor for that matter any spectator, will have much difficulty in pointing out such defects as are seen in the torso of Apollo, or the missing of one leg on the woman nearest Apollo's right, or the inaccurate folds on the right leg of the other girl on the same side, or finally the unnaturally long arm of the Lapith youth which the centaur is biting on Apollo's left. All these defects, however, disappear before the joyous spirit of life pervading the entire composition. If it was right to speak of the Aiginetan figures as *pictures* of men, it is surely correct to call the creations of the Olympia sculptors real living men and women.


CHAPTER XVII

REALIZATION OF THE NOBLEST IDEAS: THE DIVINE SIDE OF HUMAN NATURE

The equivalent of the word "soul" was first used in Greece in the middle of the fifth century B.C. by the philosopher Anaxagoras; and he, too, it is almost certain, was far from thinking of the soul as a spirit controlling the human body and its activities.

Harmony and unity had been the watchwords of the two great philosophical schools of Asia Minor and lower Italy respectively. In striving for the realization of these ideals men had overlooked the existing duality of human beings. People had appeared to be either heavenly born, or by fate bad; Greeks, or beasts like the centaurs. If the sculptors ever had noticed the combination of the divine and the physical in men they had not represented it. Indeed, it must have appeared to them unnatural and as little worthy of representation as a deformity, because both alike seemingly destroyed the harmonious unity of the composition.

The existence of this duality, however, is a fact. The sculptor cannot entirely disregard it, even if he does not understand it, provided he is skillful enough to have attained to freedom of execution. This was the case in



LEMNIAN ATHENA (Bologna)
From Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke*, Pl. III



Greece by the middle of the fifth century. The artists, therefore, found themselves confronted with the problem of choosing between the divine and the physical side of human nature; for where the legitimate coexistence of both sides was denied, or at least not appreciated, either the one or the other had to appear as the controlling motive. The selection of the particular side was, however, an unconscious process of the mind, and in result very different from much later creations, when artists willfully endeavored to suppress either the spiritual or the physical aspect of human nature. The statues of Pheidias, never carved from models, were as truly the expressions of his mental conceptions as the early "Apollon" had been the embodiments of the memory images of his predecessors.

The peculiar conceptions which the Greeks had of their gods assisted such a mode of expression. To understand it one must disregard the vulgar fictions of popular mythology, which falsely imputed to the gods many acts of violence and of depravity, since frail human nature is ever ready to imagine such deeds of those who lead a happier and less restrained existence. The danger of such stories was realized by the best men of antiquity. Plato, in his endeavor to suppress these legends, was even willing to destroy the whole of the Homeric poems because they contained some of them. The real Greek gods were far above any vile imputations; they were men, noble men and women, without

any of the limitations attaching to humanity. They could assume any shape at will, but in the performance of their divine duties and when they appeared to mortals they assumed the human form, which mortals could understand. It must never be believed that the Greeks were idolatrous to the extent of seeing actual divinity in their statues. Far from it! The Athena in the Parthenon was as little the real goddess as the modern bronze statue of Strassburg, which the Parisians lovingly deck with garlands every fourteenth of July, is the city itself. But whereas the statue in Paris is only a symbol to remind the people more forcefully of their lost possession, the Athena in Athens revealed the very shape which the goddess would assume if she deigned to show herself to mortal eyes.

To create the statue of a god, therefore, meant not only to have a perfect understanding of him but also to conceive of a human body which could worthily contain his personality and reveal it to the world. It is not difficult to see that men working along these lines encountered few obstacles in perceiving the divine side of the human body, and preferred to represent this side at all times rather than to stoop to the reproduction of forms which could never hold a god.

The chief sculptor along these lines was Pheidias. He was, as even the ancients unanimously agreed, the greatest of all artists. No other sculptor, however high at times he stood in popular favor, could attain to the

grandeur of his stature; and on no other did they feel less qualified to pass a verdict than on him. No word of blame, no wish that this or that might be different in his statues ever occurs in their writings. And the fact that their eulogies also are few is readily explained by such confessions as Pliny made, when he wanted to prove the justice of the universal praise of Pheidias, and declared that he was unable to discuss any of his great works,—for they were above human aspirations, they were divine,—and was obliged to content himself with the description of a minor decoration of the Athena Parthenos.

None of the most important statues by Pheidias have come down to the present day. They were of gold and ivory and colossal in size. The head of his Olympian Zeus is traced on a coin of Elis, and the type of the Athena Parthenos, once almost forty feet in height, is preserved in two statuettes, of which the largest measures barely three and a half feet, and a few more statues of varying sizes and doubtful authenticity. In the absence of any actual reproductions of these two important statues we fortunately possess the record of their impressions upon some art critics and archæologists of antiquity. "The measurements," says Pausanias, in speaking of the colossal chryselephantine Zeus in Olympia, "are recorded, but I will not praise those who made them, for the measurements which they give fall far short of the impression which the statue makes

upon the spectator." Quintilian, a Roman writer of the first century, even believed that this statue kept adding new strength to the religion which, in his time, was beginning to weaken before the wave of learned skepticism. And Dio Chrysostom, after saying that "our Zeus is peaceful and mild in every way, as it were the guardian of Hellas when she is of one mind, and not distraught with faction," adds his own confession, that the man who has once seen the statue cannot henceforth form another impression of the god, or think of him in any other way; and concludes with these memorable words: "If there is a man heavy laden and full of sorrow in his soul, who has suffered many evils and experienced much woe in life, so that sweet sleep does no longer visit him, I believe, if he were to stand before the statue, he would forget his sorrows, one and all, and would recover."

Such and similar expressions of admiration by the ancients give one a better idea of the importance of Pheidias than is derived from a minute study of the small copies which have lost all the grandeur of the original, and bear, as Mr. Gardner puts it, about "the same relation to Pheidias' statue as the coarsest German oleograph after the Sistine Madonna bears to the picture which it affects to reproduce." The value of these literary statements is by no means lessened by the fact that all of them were written centuries after Pheidias lived, and at a time when Greek art had run its course and was counted among the relics of the

past. If men of later days, who were accustomed to view the very best that human skill had created, could appreciate the statues of Pheidias and could read in them thoughts to satisfy their own religious needs, this is the best proof of the singularly pure conceptions which the Greek artist had embodied.

A genius like his, working so soon after the spirit of freedom had laid hold of his race, and able not only to conceive but also to express thoughts that were to govern the religious world for more than half a millenium, could not help leaving its impress alike on contemporaneous and on subsequent art. Even without Pheidias, Greek sculpture might eventually have developed as it did, but it would surely have taken more time to reach its heights.

The actual dates both of the birth and of the death of Pheidias are unknown. He was born in Athens probably about 500 B.C., and completed his studies outside his native country with Ageladas of Argos, who in antiquity had the proud reputation of having taught not only him but also Myron and Polykleitos. Soon after the Persian wars he received the commission from Athens for a large bronze group of national heroes with Miltiades as the central figure. None of the other works of Pheidias can be accurately dated except his Athena Parthenos, which was dedicated in 438 B.C. Pheidias died before Perikles (bust, page 2), his life-long friend and admirer, who succumbed to the plague

in 429. Perikles made him general supervisor over all the buildings that he erected during the many years of his supremacy in Athens. The last years of the life of Perikles were embittered by the ingratitude of the Athenians and their slanderous attacks on him and on his friends. Pheidias had to stand his share of it. He was accused of having embezzled gold intrusted to him for the making of the Athena Parthenos. Out of this accusation, the justice of which some later writers did not deny, a number of stories grew, many of which have come down to the present day.

Most modern writers—one blushes to confess it—incline to believe in the guilt of Pheidias. It is, however, impossible to believe that Pheidias correctly understood the gods, and at the same time was willing to steal the sacred material given to him for the making of their statues. Considering the most recent contributions to this subject, the weight of the argument may now be said to be overwhelmingly in favor of the innocence of Pheidias.

Of the many attempts to identify with existing statues some of the twenty-one works with which the ancients credited Pheidias only one probably has been successful. This refers to the brilliant discovery of Professor Furtwängler, who has recognized the type of the Lemnian Athena in a beautiful head in Bologna (page 202) and in two statues in Dresden. This discovery was the more difficult to make since the appearance of the

statue was completely changed by wrong restorations. By a combination of the three remains Professor Furtwängler has created a new figure in plaster, Pl. XVII, Fig. 1, which is probably a fair reproduction of the statue of Pheidias. The original was dedicated on the Akropolis of Athens by Athenian colonists who had received free land in Lemnos, at a date which is not definitely known.

The dignity of the statue is self-evident. It is a somewhat austere though kind conception of the patron goddess of Athens, and appeals to the imagination even more than to the senses. The generous bend of the magnificent head, together with the apparently voluntary rigidity of pose, conveys an excellent idea of the character of the virgin warrior who at all times had the welfare of her city at heart. That the original was of bronze is clearly seen not only from the general design of the figure but also from the execution of its details. The short garment, showing the feet, is characteristic of the transitional period and the years immediately following it; it occurs on several metopes from Olympia, but has disappeared in the copies of the Athena Parthenos. Professor Furtwängler has based on it his theory of the date of the statue, believing it to belong to the early period of the artist's activity.

It would, of course, be a mistake to make this statue the starting point of an appreciation of Pheidias; one may, however, be permitted to take it into consideration,

for if not actually made by him, it was doubtless created under those influences which by common consent are held to have emanated from him. They are perfection of transmitted forms, and expression of a profound and divinely noble character. Both these qualities are found to such a high degree in this statue that they entitle it to the attention which Professor Furtwängler's probably correct identification has given it.

The *discovery* of this statue has not taught us anything new concerning the style of Pheidias, but it has supplied us with one of the best illustrations of his art, the essence of which was the appreciation of man's noblest side. Finer bodies have been carved than that of the Lemnian Athena, and more delicate draperies have been designed than she wears. But rarely, if ever, has a single body conveyed better than hers the conviction of the artist that the spark of the divine does live in men and that it possesses the power to transform what is mortal into the image of God.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE PARTHENON

I. METOPES AND FRIEZE

That Pheidias, as is popularly believed, had an intimate connection with the Parthenon cannot be proved. Ikteinos and Kallikrates were the architects of the building, and many sculptors were engaged to carve in stone its friezes and pedimental figures. When Perikles decided upon the building of this the largest of all the Athenian temples, he did so, at least in part, in order to provide occupation for large classes of citizens whom he found it desirable to keep well occupied. Under these conditions it was impossible to engage the best sculptors only, and this is shown by the differences in workmanship, which are at times pronounced. Pheidias, who, we are told, had general charge of all the art activities during the ascendancy of Perikles, may naturally have paid special attention to the decoration of the Parthenon; but this is merely an assumption, not even based on transmitted evidence. Pheidias himself, while the temple was being built, was actively engaged in the making of his colossal gold and ivory statue of Athena, and doubtless had little time for anything else. The unity of conception,

however, which is noticed in the frieze, and the perfection especially of the figures of the east pediment, suggest that the mind of one great man was responsible for their design. This is the reason why, in the absence of artists to equal Pheidias, one turns to him; and this one does the more readily since it is known (though of a somewhat later time) that one sculptor made the designs for a pediment, while others were engaged to execute them. This was probably the case with the Parthenon. The two friezes alone contain about thirty-three hundred and thirty-two square feet of sculpture, which proves that no one man could possibly have carved all of them in the few years allotted to the task.

The temple was of the Doric order. Its outside frieze, therefore, was broken up into *metopes* and *triglyphs* (see Pl. XII, Fig. 1). The triglyphs were projecting blocks with two grooves in the center and two half grooves at the ends, which gave them the name *three-grooved*,—that is, triglyphs. The metopes were the squares between the triglyphs. On the Parthenon they were decorated with figures in high relief; on other temples they were sometimes filled with paintings or left entirely undecorated. This probably was the case on the Zeus temple in Olympia, for the carved square slabs from that temple which are known as metopes belonged to the inside of the colonnade, where they were placed above the entrance doors. In the Parthenon the interior of the colonnade was decorated in a different way, for it contained



Gods
(East Frieze of the Parthenon)



a continuous frieze, which is an ornament unknown to strictly Doric temples. It was copied from Ionic buildings, and is known as the Ionic frieze. To distinguish the two groups of sculpture on the Parthenon briefly, the outer figures of the Doric frieze are called *metopes*, and the continuous inner frieze *the frieze*.

The Metopes

When the Parthenon (see Pl. XII, Fig. 2) was destroyed in 1687 the metopes suffered most, and of ninety-two which originally encircled the building only about eighteen of the south side are well enough preserved to deserve attention. The others are so completely destroyed that not even the subjects which they represented can be distinguished with certainty. The east side may have contained the struggle between the gods and giants, the west side the battle with the Amazons, the north side the scene from the Trojan war; while the majority of the metopes on the south treated the subject which was represented on one of the Olympia pediments,—the struggle between the centaurs and the Lapiths.

The workmanship on the preserved metopes is uneven. Some contain indications that their sculptors have accepted the new order of things, and belong to the age of Pheidias; others reveal practices in keeping with the older school. Such a survival of old traditions is not at all astonishing. Indeed, it would have

been a marvel if the entire art of sculpture had completely changed in one short generation. The thing of importance is that none of the adherents of the older mode of carving left any pupils for the next generation; for the people then builded entirely upon the new achievements of Pheidias and his school, and paid no attention to the conservatists.

One of the best metopes, Pl. XXI, Fig. 1, shows a Lapith victorious over a centaur. He has wounded him in the small of the back, as the gesture of the beast indicates, and running up behind him, wheels about to fetch a blow. The conception of the figures is full of life, but retarded by the introduction of the drapery. If one imagines the garment away, the youth gains in power and in swiftness. Before one's very eyes he seems to turn, ready to deal his blow. Why should the sculptor have been willing to spoil the vigor of his composition by hanging a piece of drapery over the arms of the Lapith? Why should he condemn him to eternal inactivity? The answer to these questions is found in the fact that it was almost impossible to fill the entire space of a metope with two figures without leaving either in the corners or in the center an empty space of noticeable dimensions. Empty spaces, however, were, especially in the fifth century, a horror to the Greeks. This sculptor, therefore, rather than offend the eye by such an empty space, weakened the original design. The design may be by Pheidias, the drapery this man's own addition.

On the next metope, Pl. XXI, Fig. 2, the tables are turned with a vengeance. The Lapith is dying; and while his head is sinking low, the centaur dances above him in exultant glee. The right leg of the centaur—now broken—is locked with the limb of his foe. Swinging the boy's leg up and down, the prancing beast draws fresh hilarity from every touch. The panther skin catches the frenzy, and behind the centaur's back its lifeless tail and paw swing in the wind in wildest excitement. Even its grimace is cruelly staring down on the dying boy. The lost head of the centaur possibly showed some of the wanton bestiality which is still reflected in his whisking tail.

The dying boy is less well represented because, in the first place, the representation of the dead offered problems which were not fully solved for several generations. It is not enough to carve a *lifeless* form; the artist must show that it is a form *created to live*, that is, a living body with life now suddenly departed. Another reason was that the high position of the metope, and the sharp angle at which it was seen, offered the same difficulties that had induced the Aigina sculptors to show their warriors as dying rather than as dead. A body lying flat on its back at some height is hardly seen, not to speak of the fact that its thickness, if correctly carved, appears disproportionately thin, owing to the peculiarity of human vision. Considerations of this kind explain the readiness of subsequent sculptors to deviate from

the even level upon which the action of their figures on temple sculptures ought to take place.

The artist of this metope has successfully filled one of the empty spaces of his slab with the panther skin. This skin, a technical necessity in the first place, has eventually become such an integral part of the composition that without it the metope would lose in vital interest. This shows mastery over the limitations of space and material. The artist, no longer their slave, has begun to be their master! Herein perhaps lies one of the foremost characteristics of the best of Greek art,—that the artists voluntarily submit to restrictions, but turn them into successes. In early Greek sculpture the submission was less voluntary and the skill too slight to overcome difficulties. In later times the skill was so great and the submission so well disguised that it almost appeared to be undesigned and the unhampered expression of a first conception. Throughout, however, the ultimate success was due to the delight which the artists took in proving themselves masters over all those outside considerations which under different conditions would have been powerful checks upon the free exercise of their art.

On another Parthenon metope, Pl. X, Fig. 3, the sculptor has shown that he has not yet attained freedom in his profession. His subject is a centaur cantering off with a Lapith woman. The artist realized that the representation of the similar motive in Olympia,

Pl. X, Fig. 2, had not been altogether successful; for as long as the woman had her feet firmly planted on the ground, the progress of the centaur had to be slow. In the metope, therefore, the beast has snatched the woman high up in the air; and this, of course, meant that her head projected above his. The highest point at which her head could be represented was given by the upper edge of the block. But this was the level on which generally the centaur heads were carved. It was therefore necessary to compress the upper part of his body in order to carry out the idea of the composition. The general proportions of the centaur, however, were given by the length of his horse's body, which, considering the architecturally fixed width of the metope, could not be lessened for fear of leaving too great a space unfilled at either side. The result was a deformed and almost hunchbacked centaur, doing violence to the general conception of one of his race. The metope is, moreover, decidedly unpleasant to look at; nor are empty spaces avoided. The compression of this figure and the necessarily slight drapery of the woman, fluttering behind his back, leave a large part in the left-hand upper corner of the slab unfilled. Altogether this metope is perhaps the least satisfactory of all that are preserved, and that in spite of the soundness of the considerations which led to its first design. The fact is, the sculptor realized at every turn the obstacles that arose, without being able to cope with all.

Almost every one of the metope figures of the Parthenon is an independent and new creation, at least in so far as the scarcity of extant contemporaneous sculpture permits one to judge. In one slab, however, the youth bears considerable resemblance to the Harmodios of the Tyrannicide group. It is therefore not at all unlikely that some of the other figures also may have preserved the types of now lost statues.

The Frieze

The Ionic frieze encircling the temple walls on the inside of the colonnade measured originally almost five hundred and twenty-three feet, of which four hundred and ten feet have survived the explosion; but of these only about three hundred feet are well enough preserved to repay a detailed study. The frieze was continuous; it was nearly forty feet above the ground, and seen under dim light. The impression, therefore, of disjointed slabs in well-lighted galleries to-day is different from, and probably far inferior to, the impression intended by the artists. Of no other Greek work can it be said with equal truth that to form even an approximate idea of its lost magnificence is impossible. But what the frieze has lost in artistic value by having been brought close to the eye of the spectator, it has gained in another direction; for to-day one can follow on it, as never before, the devices of the artists which enabled them to gain complete mastery over difficulties of technique and design.



HORSEMEN
(West Frieze of Parthenon, Athens)

It is not necessary to mention all the devices, for with hardly an exception they go to show that the artists were willing to accept some well-defined laws of their art as binding upon them, but never as offering unsurmountable obstacles.

The subject of the frieze was the procession of the Panathenaic festival. It was as little an accurate rendering of the gorgeous pageant as contemporaneous sculpture was a copy from models; both alike were the expressions of the artists' conceptions. The chief integral parts of the procession—the cavalcade and the chariots, the sacrificial implements and the victims, the men and women on foot, and the assembly of magistrates on the Akropolis—are distinguished, but they are not brought out with the accuracy expected of the modern portrayer of historic events. No one who walks along the Parthenon frieze can help feeling the spirit of religious enthusiasm and national pride which was the quintessence of the Panathenaic festival. But if a man has familiarized himself, from literature, with the exact procedure followed on these occasions, and is looking for any particular moment to be represented in the frieze, he will be disappointed.

After having decided upon the subject and its general mode of representation, the artists had to settle the question of how to arrange it about the building. Beginning at the southwest corner on the west side, Pl. XVI, Fig. 4, which was the nearest to the Propylaia, the

only gate of the Akropolis, the procession continued from right to left along the north to the east, where before the quiet company of gods it came to a standstill. A similar procession was seen approaching the gods from the other side, and if one followed it back around the corner to the south wall it too was seen to begin on the southwest corner. It may be questioned whether such an arrangement is altogether satisfactory, for there was a definite break in the composition at the corner where the procession started in opposite directions. The artists, however, carved the figures here in such a fashion that the break became less noticeable. Few people, moreover, approaching, as was customary, from the west, would be apt to go round to the southwest and along it to the entrance door, because the regular way led along the north. No one, therefore, under ordinary conditions would ever actually see the procession start in opposite directions.

The meeting of the two processions on the east frieze (see page 60) was even more skillfully managed. The very extensive group of the gods in the center was divided in two by five figures, probably the priest and priestess and three attendants, immediately over the middle of the entrance door, while six or more magistrates were seen on either side of the gods. They stood about in a haphazard way, passing in conversation the time of waiting. Those nearest the corner were discerning the maidens who headed the procession, and gave

the word to the others, "They are coming!" This is the interest of the moment, by reason of which one utterly forgets to notice whence they are coming, especially since all are heading for the entrance of the Parthenon.

It would have been possible, of course, to arrange the composition differently, — to begin, for instance, at one corner and carry the procession around the four sides of the temple, or to begin in the center of one side and divide the composition in two equal halves; but if one takes the pains of thinking out the logical difficulties accruing from such arrangements, one soon realizes that the Parthenon sculptors were wise in their selection.

The impression which one carries away from an actual procession is harmonious, as of one complete whole, in spite of the many integral parts of which it consists. There were, therefore, no breaks permissible in the frieze. The rapidly moving cavalcade was to follow upon the preliminary preparations, without exhibiting any figures on which the spectator could fasten his eyes and say, "Here they begin to canter rapidly"; and the slower chariots, and men and women on foot, had to follow upon the galloping horsemen without showing a definite spot which could be said to mark the end of the rapid movement and the beginning of the more stately advance. And all this was to be done without any violence to the proper spirit of each separate part of the procession. How well the artists solved these manifold

problems can only be seen when one views the frieze in its entirety, but even the study of separate slabs offers some definite hints.

The whole west side, pages 60 and 218, was reserved for what may be called "preparations." The very first figure is one of the marshals. Many of them are scattered along the lines, arranging the men and urging them forward, or restraining their too rapid progress. The first marshal has half turned toward the southern side, where the procession is to move from left to right. His gestures seem to beckon to men unseen to come along and get ready with the rest to move from right to left. The two horses near him already hold the direction of this half of the procession, but a youth leisurely tying his sandal strap is pointing to the right. He has his foot on the stepping-stone and may soon mount his horse. In thought, therefore, he clearly belongs to the direction of his horse; in masses, on the other hand, he points just as distinctly toward the movement around the corner on the southern frieze. On the next slab a horse is running away; he has turned and is cantering off, when he is caught by a man. Nothing is more natural than that a horse should break away from the direction followed by his companions. He does not therefore break, in thought, the onward movement of this side of the frieze, while his new direction contains one last hint of the movement on the other side. If nothing was left of the west frieze except these three

slabs, it would be difficult to determine, at the first glance, in which direction the procession was to move, for the figures on them, designed as connecting links between the two opposite directions, are neutral as regards their lines and masses. Their thoughts, on the other hand, leave, upon careful inspection, not the least doubt of the direction which they are going to follow. When one has come in one's review of the frieze to the runaway horse, one has sufficiently entered upon the general spirit of the west frieze to render any more references to the south side unnecessary. For safety's sake, however, the artists introduced, before turning the north corner, two or three more echoes of the opposite direction.

The next problem was how to double up the horsemen gradually, when the first groups had been single men and horses. The first two horses are standing one in front of the other, with their riders near by. Then comes the runaway. He is caught by his owner, with the assistance of a friend, whose own horse in the meantime canters up close to the next man. In front is a group of an impatient horse and a talkative owner, and then a group of two horses mounted. These horses, however, which are only very little nearer each other than those on the earlier slab, show no intentional doubling up, following quite naturally upon the lines and masses that have preceded. The possible danger of having the differences in thought of these groups

noticed is also avoided by the introduction of an especially interesting slab between them, where a restive horse is scratching his nose on his fore legs.

What the Olympia sculptor had for the first time tried on the west pediment is here carried out to perfection. The lines and the masses make their united appeal to the spectator, whose attention is quickly carried to new parts, owing to differences of thought expressed in seemingly similar groups. With such a treatment transitions are quickly and unnoticeably made; for the masses are generally sufficiently alike to disguise them. When necessary, groups are interposed which, without being in the least extraneous to the composition, are of individual and immediate interest. There is in every new group an echo of one that has preceded and a hidden indication of one that is to follow.

Making use of the double appeal of a group upon the eye and the imagination, it was not difficult to increase or to decrease the rapidity of the procession without disclosing the devices employed. The whole of the west frieze was to give the impression of preparation. Its last figure, therefore, like its first, is a marshal. But this time the marshal is not exciting his men to greater hurry, but is placidly awaiting the approach of two youths who are cantering up to him. They do not ride side by side, but the one behind the other; for just as cleverly as the figures are doubled up in the beginning they are separated toward the end. A second runaway

horse is then introduced, and later, after another group of two, a leader of nobler bearing and richer accouterments, who would naturally ride alone. Then follows a boy, dismounted, and finally, after two more riders, — one of whom has fallen behind and is trying to catch up with his companion, — an entirely different group: a youth is fixing his fillet, while one of the marshals, who is holding the boy's horse, is conversing with a little slave.

On the northern frieze the cavalcade is formed and cantering off at great speed. But the first figures, Pl. XX, Fig. 2, are quiet in lines, the very first in fact being a standing boy fastening his master's belt. In the background a rider is seen, and in front a dismounted horseman, whose figure preserves a definite echo of the lines of one of the last boys on the west frieze. Here he is following his prancing steed, and by his gestures urging his dilatory companion to hurry along. In masses the first two figures of the north frieze are as quiet as the first two of the west frieze. In thought, suggested by the waving arm of the youth in front, they are infinitely more closely connected with the quicker movement of the north frieze.

The cavalcade, Pl. XX, Fig. 1, proceeds in rows of at first four and then six deep. The seemingly confused lines of the many horses' legs carry out the impression of great rapidity. Before one has looked over many slabs one has completely entered into the

joyful spirit of celerity pervading the Athenian cavalry, the pride of the city. To continue the mixed-up lines of closely packed and prancing horses very long would have been tedious to the eye. Occasionally, therefore, there is a let-up, with one or more figures singled out from the rest. At such places of comparatively quiet lines there was danger of having a lull suggested unless the tension was kept up by the thought expressed in the figures. This the artists have done with astounding skill. The first of these horsemen riding alone, Pl. XX, Fig. 4, is checking his horse to fall back of his companions; he leans about and by word and gesture seems to urge those behind him to gallop up and fill the space which intervened between their squad and his. The single rider, therefore, far from suggesting a break in the rapidity of the procession, adds to its swiftness; for the cavalcade, however fast it has seemed to be cantering thus far, will have to go even faster in order to catch up with those in front. The impression of velocity, therefore, left with the spectators is not all due to the lines which they have already seen, but in great part to the suggestive gestures of this one horseman. Thus again an appeal is made not only to the eye but also to the imagination.

Another single figure, Pl. XX, Fig. 3, is introduced when, toward the end of the cavalry lines, provision must be made for the quieter movements of the chariots. Here the straight and quiet lines of a marshal

break the previous confusion. He is standing fairly alone. In front of him the horses are less crowded, as if curbed to wait for the battalions in the rear, to whom the marshal seems to be beckoning. The thought of speedy onward movement, therefore, does not receive a setback by his presence, while the lines of his body, by their stability, make ready preparations for the more restful figures to come. These are the charioteers in the first place, and in front of them the old men and musicians, the youths with the sacred implements, and then the heavily draped men leading the animals to the sacrifice. Their draperies and their measured steps finally lead up to the procession of maidens which begins at the corners of the east frieze.

The arrangement of the south frieze is very much like that of the north frieze, except that the musicians and the sheep are omitted and that the other parts of the pageant are correspondingly enlarged. This frieze is not nearly so well preserved as the other, but it contains some of the most beautiful creations among the cavalymen and the chariot horses. The technique, however, is often less excellent, as was the case with the metopes on this side.

The east frieze, page 60, is the most quiet of all. About two thirds of its entire extent are reserved for the seated gods in the center and the group of priests between them. Of the remaining third a considerable portion is given to the magistrates who have not taken

part in the procession but have assembled on the Akropolis to receive it. The gradual approach of the maidens to these many quiet figures is splendidly done. The transitions from the standing to the walking figures have been managed by interposing others who, though restful in lines, are yet suggestive of movement. To the right of the gods there are six magistrates, of whom four are conversing together, Pl. XV, Fig. 3, and two have just separated, the one to turn to the coming procession, the other to call the attention of his colleagues to the approaching maidens. The maidens themselves are greeted by another man, who seems to have received a vessel from the first couple of girls, while back of them a marshal is giving his final instructions to two more. His word is passed along the line, and in order to repeat it one of the girls of the third couple is falling back to speak to her sisters behind her. This marks the transition from the maidens who walk by two and two to those who walk alone, in keeping with the single men around the corner who lead the animals.

The two ends of the east frieze correspond to one another closely, but they exhibit sufficient variety to guard against any seeming repetition or monotony. The right-hand side, however, is by all odds the most interesting. The twelve seated gods, whose sameness of position might have been an easy excuse for identity of conception, show such remarkable individuality that

only the present slight knowledge of their characters renders it impossible to call them by name in every instance. Zeus, page 212, the father and king of the gods, is readily recognized by his royal bearing, especially if he is compared with the others who are sitting on simpler seats. Of these chairs, or thrones, none are carved with the delicacy and the care which characterize the pieces of furniture on the "Harpy" tomb, Pl. VI, Figs. 1 and 2, where the accessories received fully as much attention as the figures themselves. On the Parthenon this is different, only those accessories being represented that are absolutely necessary.

More than three hundred and fifty human figures are represented on the Parthenon frieze. No two are alike, and that in spite of the fact that many are seen in practically identical positions. Of about one hundred and twenty-five horses of the cavalry every single one is different from every other. There are many transitions from slow to rapid movement and vice versa, but there is not one place upon which one can lay one's finger and say, "Here is a break." Despite its numberless variety, therefore, the frieze leaves with the beholder the impression of one complete and harmonious whole.

For almost a century people have admired the Parthenon frieze without considering the problems which the artist had to solve. The solutions, however, are so perfect that the frieze appears the more wonderful the

more one realizes them, until at last one comes to look upon it as something marvelous. In antiquity sculptured decorations of temples did not rank among the great masterpieces. The masterpieces themselves are now lost, or are preserved in a fragmentary condition, many of them only in copies. From such *secondary* creations, however, as the Parthenon frieze, it is possible to draw conclusions as to the lost works of art, and to learn how to appreciate them. Such appreciation is by no means impaired by the few instances of failure on the frieze, as when a horseman without a horse had to be introduced on the west frieze to fill a gap; or, for the same reason, the marshal in front of the fourth chariot on the northern frieze, Pl. XVI, Fig. 3, had to be carved of unnaturally large dimensions. These instances of comparative failure in the selection of the proper means to conquer the difficulties of space are very rare, and always treated with such delicacy that they pass unnoticed in a general survey of the entire composition.

The blocks of the frieze which form integral parts of the architectural structure of the Parthenon must have been done when the building was dedicated in 438 B.C. The first definite plans for the erection of the Parthenon were made in 454. Owing to the time it must have taken to carve the frieze, its design doubtless dates from the earlier year. And that was hardly thirty years after the Persian wars!

CHAPTER XIX

THE PARTHENON

II. THE PEDIMENTS

The east pediment of the Parthenon contained large groups of figures, which by their actions and attitudes told the story of the birth of the goddess Athena. When the Christians changed the temple into a church, and placed the new altar in its east side, they built there, according to their custom, a rounded apse. To do this they removed the central portions of all the decorations; but so careful were they that some slabs of the frieze were preserved in the interior of the building, and have not suffered at all. This establishes a presumption in favor of equal care bestowed on the central pedimental figures. All of them have disappeared, but it is not impossible that some day they may turn up again, perhaps in a museum, where they have passed unnoticed because separated and therefore less readily recognized. More than once the attempt has actually been made to identify one or the other Athena statue with the Parthenon pediment, but never yet to universal satisfaction. This is largely due to the fact that it is not certain which moment "relating to the birth of Athena," as Pausanias puts it, the artist had selected for representation.

Athena, according to the myth, had sprung fully armed from the head of Zeus. Both she and her father, therefore, were doubtless among the prominent figures of the pediment. But which of them held the central place? Zeus in similar scenes on vase paintings, and also on a marble relief now in Madrid, which may have been inspired by the Parthenon, is seated. Assuming that the same was the case on the Parthenon, and that Zeus was represented on his throne directly under the apex of the roof, where the pediment is the highest, then a moment slightly subsequent to the birth itself might have been represented, when Athena had jumped from her father's head and was advancing either to his right or his left. This arrangement, however, by adding special weight to the side where the goddess was represented, would have spoiled the harmonious balance of the two halves of the pediment; for on her own temple no one, of course, could be a proper balance to Athena save perhaps Zeus himself. If, on the other hand, the birth was actually represented, that is the very moment when Athena appeared from the head of her father, then on account of the limitations of space she would have been diminutive in size; for the large figures of gods standing to the right and left of the center prevented the sculptor from reducing the proportion of the seated Zeus for the sake of more space for Athena. But such a diminutive size of the goddess (the ridiculous appearance of which is seen in vase paintings) was nowhere



THE "THREE FATES"
(East Pediment of Parthenon, British Museum)



less in place than on her own temple, not to speak of the great difficulty of designing an artistically satisfactory group of two figures, of whom the one appears through an unnatural aperture made in the body of the other.

Professor Kekulé von Stradonitz has pointed out that Christian art had to grapple with a similar problem in the representation of the creation of Eve. The best solutions were given by Michelangelo and by Raphael. Michelangelo represented the almost completed creation of the woman, whose feet alone were hidden in the side of Adam, but under such a dense shadow that the unpleasantness of the earlier representations of an open wound was avoided. Raphael pictured the moment immediately following Eve's creation, when she stood before Adam, and only his amazed looks betrayed the recentness of her appearance.

No direct inferences can be drawn from these pictures as to the Parthenon pediments, beyond perhaps the lesson that the genius of the Greek sculptor could have found as satisfactory a solution for the problems which confronted him as Michelangelo and Raphael found for theirs,—even though his were the more difficult problems of sculpture as compared with those of painting. If we to-day, with all the central figures of the pediment lost, were able to reconstruct it, we would thereby show that our genius was equal to his. But this, after a study of the frieze, appears little likely to

be the case. It is therefore a futile, though for many people an apparently not uninteresting, attempt to offer imaginary reconstructions of the lost parts of the pediment. In all that have been published the grand simplicity and convincing directness of the few preserved corner figures is completely lost.

For an understanding of the ten preserved figures, Pl. XII, Figs. 3 and 4, it is fortunately not necessary to know just how the center was arranged; for it suffices to realize that some moment of intimate connection with the birth of Athena was represented. Athena was the goddess of the air, of that clear crispness of the atmosphere which the Athenians believed had given them their intellectual superiority. She was the goddess of wisdom and thrifty pursuits of the house and home; she was the patron goddess of Athens. Her birth, in short, meant for her people the creation of the only kind of life that was worth living. It is little wonder, therefore, that the message of her birth should arouse in the Athenians an intensity of emotion not unlike the feelings with which devout Christians listen to the message of Bethlehem.

To portray these feelings was the purpose of the east-pediment sculptor. He could absolve himself of his task in two ways,—either by showing the figures which surrounded the central scene transported by joy and admiration, or by suggesting in their forms and attitudes those feelings which they would display when the news

reached them. The sculptor, knowing the impossibility of catching in stone the height of an emotion, selected the latter way. An attempt in the other direction may often make a more powerful first appeal; it must, however, always fall short of that intensity of feeling which is left to the imagination. The corner figures, therefore, are conceived so far away from the center as not to be aware of the birth of Athena; for this birth, the legend says, was an occurrence of surprising suddenness.

The sun god alone, in the farthest left-hand corner, Pl. XVIII, Fig. 2, seems to have had an idea of the importance of the day which he was ushering in. Head and shoulders he rises from the sea with his four horses of "snowy whiteness." Only their heads show above the rippling waves, which flow off their necks and cling to the muscular arms of the god. The roof of the pediment projected and shut out the rays of the sun, which had gone round toward the south by the time the procession arrived before the Parthenon. This corner, therefore, was the darkest spot of the entire composition. The horses were slightly more in the light. In their eagerness to hasten the day they pulled in uneven rows, so that the nigh horse was pushed far out. As he raised his head it projected considerably beyond the edge of the pedimental roof; it caught and fully reflected the rays of the sun,—it was the dawn announcing Helios!

Helios is the only one of the preserved figures of this side who faces the central action. The next three figures, Pl. XII, Fig. 3, form one group, of which the nearest is a god or hero in a remarkably quiet attitude; he is seated on a rock spread with a drapery, and is watching, perhaps, the sunrise. In the absence of a better name (most of the names given these figures are hypothetical) he is often called Theseus. "Theseus," Pl. XVIII, Fig. 1, has his back turned upon the central scene. He has heard no word of what is taking place there; he is not engaged in anything in particular, and appears to be the embodiment of perfect repose and equanimity. The very lines of his figure are self-centered, not carrying one with sweeping force to his neighbors on either side, as is frequently the case on the slabs of the frieze. The drapery on his seat, with the folds all radiating from one point in beautiful variety, is a study of perfection. They remind one of the folds on the metope with the victorious Lapith, Pl. XXI, Fig. 1, or the indications of folds on the panther skin on another metope, Pl. XXI, Fig. 2; but they are far ahead of either. Even his back is carved with great skill, offering an indication of the original appearance of the front before it had suffered under the inclemency of the weather. His feet and hands are broken in the most unfortunate places, because the pointed stumps of the arms and legs are unpleasant to look at. His face also has become battered beyond possibility of recognition;

only the powerful contours of his head are discernible. He was carved for an exalted position, and was not intended to be studied close at hand or removed from his surroundings. He was a part of the entire composition, and not an individual with passions of his own. This accounts for the fact that he now often fails to interest when he is placed by himself, and not rarely close to the Hermes of Praxiteles. The ancient sculptor would be the first to recognize this fact. To draw conclusions, therefore, as often is done, from this figure, as to the art standard of his time, is unfair.

In masses the "Theseus" belongs as clearly to the next two figures, Pl. XII, Fig. 3, as the "Three Fates" on the other side of the pediment belong together. The two women are carved as one intimate group. This is seen not only from their attitudes but also from the fact that their seats and bodies appear to be hewn of one block. Because of this intimacy they are generally called Demeter and Persephone. They are engaged in conversation, as appears from their gestures. The fracture of the neck of the taller woman indicates that she had turned her head to her companion. Her whole attitude shows that she cannot keep her head long in this position; she has *just* turned, and in this instant Athena is born. The next minute she will look back to the center, toward which her body is inclined, and to which the lines of her raised arm are pointing; then she will see Athena, and will rise—her left leg is drawn in—and

pass the word, and her companion will jump up, and "Theseus" will hear the news, and from Helios and his eager horses on to the center there will be one group of figures revealing their joy and awe at the glorious event of the birth of Athena.

This idea is helped along by the last of the preserved figures, perhaps Iris, Pl. XIX, Fig. 3, the messenger of the gods, who, with her message of realized freedom, is hurrying past the women down to waiting humanity. The swiftness of her onward movement is shown in the long deep gulfs of her folds, and in the lines of her body, which leans forward gently to encounter the powerful winds that her velocity has awakened.

Somewhere near by, but perhaps on the other side, there was another figure, Pl. XIX, Fig. 2, probably sent on the same errand. This figure is not running, like Iris, but flying. She wears a short chiton, which leaves her knees bare, and cannot therefore be Nike, as she is generally called; for Nike was never thus represented. Catching the breath of air, her thin drapery is pressed against her beautiful body, and at the side is fluttering away with the passing wind.

This figure, which does not appear in the drawings, Pl. XIV, Fig. 2, of the east pediment which Jacques Carrey made eleven years before the explosion of the Parthenon, bears a faint resemblance to one of the figures which he drew on the west frieze, and which is now lost. When the Parthenon sculptures were removed to

England, Visconti, the then greatest archæologist, published detailed accounts of them. Of this figure, he said he did not know its provenance. In a later publication, he said the figure belonged to the east pediment, without giving the reasons for his change of mind; but this omission on his part is responsible for the mistake of some scholars who, disregarding his later statement, have assigned the "Nike" to the west pediment. These same men, however, are constantly accepting other assertions of Visconti without proof. If the order of his publications was reversed, there might be an excuse for discrediting him; but since he made the positive statement last, and probably after having found additional data, there is no reason to doubt his word. The fractures of the arms, moreover, show that "Nike" held her arms very differently from the figure drawn by Carrey; and since in spirit, finally, she belongs unmistakably to the east pediment, it is wrong to assign her to any other place.

Perhaps the most beautiful, and surely the best known, figures of the east pediment are the "Three Fates," page 232. They balance "Theseus" and the two seated figures on the other side. But while the two seated figures there are carved from one block and in close juxtaposition, one seated and one reclining figure are thus treated here. The sculptor was prompted by the same feeling for variety in the balance of his figures that had controlled the compositions of the earlier artist who carved

the relief of Apollo and the Nymphs and Hermes and the Graces, Pl. VII, Figs. 1-3. The perfect ease and graceful indifference of the reclining figure are beyond description. Who could ever, even for a moment, imagine that she is lying there in the lap of her sister for any other reason than that she wants to? Who could ever think of the limitation of space, and of the fact that the pediment roof is coming down here so low that she *has* to be represented reclining? The perfection of these figures lies in the fact that they are the most adequate expression of their conceptions. It is therefore more disturbing than helpful to have any one point out the means by which the artists have attained their success.

Directly in front of the "Fates" the moon is driving her chariot into the sea. The well-preserved head of one of her horses, Pl. XVIII, Fig. 3, is often called the most sublime creation of ancient animal sculpture. It is a beautiful head, but hardly nobler in conception than the spirited nigh horse of Helios welcoming the day. The two horses are different: there the joy at the beginning, here the quiet pleasure at the course that has been run. Between them they may mark the day of the birth of Athena.

In keeping with the more peaceful representation of the moon, all the figures on this side are quieter. The seated figure, however, has already drawn in her foot, preparatory to rising, and is half leaning forward. Soon

the news of the central action will come to her, and she will rise and pass the word, and her companion will hear it and in her turn counsel the resting sister to wake to the full realization of what has occurred. In a minute these figures will join in the joyful expression of the one thought which pervades the pediment, — "Athena is born!"

With these ten figures one forgets the limitations of a triangular space which they were designed to fill. In Aigina such limitations were ever present; in the west pediment of Olympia they could not disappear because the spectator was constantly reminded of the skill with which the artist had successfully striven to overcome them; in the Parthenon they are non-existing. It is impossible to think of these figures as carved in any other way. However much or however little space there may be above them, they must be thus or not at all.

Because of this supreme mastery, this willingness to submit to restrictions and then make them appear not to be restrictions, one is tempted to assign this pediment to the greatest sculptor of the time, to Pheidias. This attribution, therefore, is not made on the strength of any external evidence, such as the story that he had charge of all the buildings, but on the internal evidence of unrivaled excellence of composition. To assign the pediment to Pheidias does not mean to credit him with having carved all or even a majority of the figures with

his own hand. This would have been impossible. It suggests, however, that the superiority of the "Fates" over all other figures, even "Nike," may possibly be due to his touch.

The West Pediment

The west pediment is less successful, although it too marked a great advance over previous achievements. When Carrey made his drawings it was almost intact, so that its composition is well known to-day. The figures themselves, however, are almost completely destroyed. When Morosini was forced to leave Athens in 1688 he wanted to take some "keepsakes" away with him, and decided upon the central figures of the west pediment. His workmen were careless and lacking in skill; the ropes broke, the figures fell, and "were broken to dust," as the old chronicler relates. This was not literally true, because fragments of them have been found about the Parthenon; they were, however, so badly broken that Morosini no longer cared for them. But some other pieces he and his companions seem to have taken away with them to Venice. A head among them was probably from the Parthenon; for it shows the same formation of the skull as "Theseus," who is the only figure whose head is not lost. This head, Pl. XXXIX, Fig. 2, eventually came into the hands first of a Mr. Weber, and then of Comte Laborde. To-day it is in Paris, known as the Weber or the Laborde head. The

restoration of an outrageous nose and of conventional lips has completely spoiled it. What has become of the other figures is not known. Carrey drew eighteen (perhaps twenty) almost intact, Pl. XIV, Fig. 2; to-day not more than six have left recognizable fragments, while only one fairly complete statue is known.

This well-preserved statue, Pl. XIII, Fig. 4, from the north corner of the pediment, Pausanias called a river god; to-day it is known as "Kephissos" or "Ilissos." The flowing lines of the figure, and of its drapery which has the appearance of actual dampness, certainly are more in keeping with the conception of a river god than were several of the Olympia figures which Pausanias explained in the same way. The southeast figure there, with its bold twist, marked a great advance over the dying warrior from Aigina, and showed the comparative freedom of conception to which the artist had advanced. Compared with the "Kephissos" that freedom was slight, for it was new and untried. The Parthenon sculptor, on the other hand, who knew the human body better, and was familiar with every twist and turn that the several sets of muscles permit a man to make simultaneously, has shown his knowledge to a degree which is almost unpleasant in its perfection. This is largely due to the fact that he selected a moment for representation which at best is instantaneous; for it requires a painful exercise of muscular energy to keep one's self long in the position of "Kephissos." The transitory

ought only to be represented when the movement is swift, as in the figures by Myron; for it leaves the impression of a permanent position when the movement is slow. This is the case with "Kephissos," who, if he is not altogether painful to look at, especially not at a casual glance, owes this to the use that is made of his drapery. Apparently the artist intended to give the impression of an easily flowing curve suggestive of flowing water. Knowing the impossibility of pressing the human form into such a curve without doing great violence to nature, he designed the drapery to convey his idea. The drapery is not seen to its full extent; for it disappears behind the back of the god, and toward the end is only dimly recognized. Enough of it is seen, however, to *suggest* the rest. The curve of the body compared with the curve of the drapery is slight; and because it is so much less than that suggested by the drapery, the fact is overlooked that it is more than a body can express without losing its graceful appearance.

Thus a new principle of art is established which is the natural outcome of suggesting more than can be seen, and consists of suggesting *less than is actually carved*. Such a device is, of course, only permissible when the position of the figure, or other conditions, renders a continuous inspection impossible, so that the beholder is obliged to rely on his first impression. This was the case with "Kephissos"; for at the height of more than fifty feet it would have been painful for the

visitor to crane his neck in order to look at him long. The dangerous twist of his body, therefore, was probably consciously resorted to by the artist, who not only knew the help it would be in carrying out the suggested idea of the flowing curve but who also trusted to the height of the pediment to have it passed unscrutinized. At the present day, when the statue is seen on the level and is constantly so photographed, scrutiny can, of course, no longer be deferred.

The subject of the pediment was the struggle between Athena and Poseidon for the guardianship of Athens. Was the future of Athens to lie on the sea or on the land? Everybody knows that it was the Athenian fleet which brought her her victories, and nobody doubts that it was this same fleet which hastened her fall. The most conservative men in Athens always opposed her dominion on the sea. And even the great masses of the people, carried away by the brilliant policies of Themistokles and Alkibiades, believed, it seems, in the bottom of their hearts that Athens was most securely founded in the resources of her land. The empire gained on the sea was lost within one century; the achievements made on land, under the guardianship of Athena, have survived two millennia.

The contest of the rival gods was to take place before their assembled peers. They had agreed that he should receive the prize who gave to the citizens of Athens the most valuable gift. Poseidon struck the rock with his

trident, and revealed a salt spring. This was his symbolic gift of the dominion over the sea. So confident was he that this was the best possible present, that in the pediment he is seen stepping over the center line, ready to assume his place as guardian god. But then Athena creates the olive tree, and Poseidon himself has to recoil before the superiority of Athena's gift. This sudden retreat of the god, who had begun to place himself in the center of the pediment, was the most powerful tribute that could have been paid to Athena's gift. The importance of the olive tree was thus brought out much more strongly by means of suggestion than it could have been actually represented.

These two gods filled the large center space of the pediment extremely well. Poseidon was naturally of larger proportions than Athena, and belonged on account of his forwardness just as naturally more directly under the apex of the roof, where the pediment was higher than it was where Athena stood. Both gods are accompanied by their chariots. Their horses enter into the spirit of the contest and are rearing, with their heads high up in the air. In this way the artist tried to fill the large spaces at the sides of Athena and of Poseidon. The result, however, was not successful. The chariots, which occupy too much space, put the figures in the corners out of touch with the powerful central scene. The relation, therefore, of all these figures to the general plan of the composition is slight, for

they appear to be introduced for the sole purpose of filling the corners. The whole story is told by the two central figures; the other figures, instead of intensifying it, detract from its vividness.

The Parthenon sculptures, then, in spite of all their excellence, are not perfect, nor can any work of art be perfect in the sense of suggesting no thoughts that have not found their full expression. Perfection in mediocrity is readily attained, but in the highest regions it is rare. The thoughts there are so many and so lofty that they defy concrete interpretation. The greatest work of art is one which, while it stimulates the noblest feelings, offers to the intellect the least chance of finding fault with its execution. Judged by this standard, the Parthenon sculptures in the field of art rank, and probably always will rank, second to none.

CHAPTER XX

THE HUMAN BODY

While Pheidias the Athenian strove to express his visions of gods and godlike men, some of his contemporaries struck out in a different direction. A body is a body, they apparently thought, beautiful in itself and well deserving of careful study. The question with them was not, What is the noblest thought which a body may be made to express? but, What is the best way of representing the body itself? Men like Pheidias and his immediate co-workers might be divinely unconscious of the best mode of carving the human form; the depth of their thoughts ennobled whatever vehicle they chose. In the hands of lesser men the practice of Pheidias might have been unsuccessful if it had not been for the beneficial influence of this other school.

This school was headed by Polykleitos of Argos, a man who in skill and science was second to none, but who was impatient, it seems, of the vastness of ideas by which men are elevated above themselves. "True art," Mr. Ruskin says, "emanates from the heart, and associates with it the head, yet as inferior to the heart, and the hand, yet as inferior to the heart and head, and thus brings out the whole man." All the



HERA OF ARGOS (Athens)
Correct view

art of Pheidias emanated from the heart, — that is, the soul, the noble personality of the man. It makes its chief appeal, therefore, to those people who possess vigor and sincerity of emotion. Argive art emanated from the head, to which the skill of the hand was added as a worthy second. Dr. Waldstein in his recent essay on Polykleitos comes to the conclusion that Polykleitos was the Greek sculptor of beauty *par excellence*. This may be so, but his was only physical beauty, pleasant to behold when it was at its best, as in the fragments from the recently excavated Argive Heraion (which may be his), but never synonymous with goodness and nobility, the contact with which makes men better and happier.

THE TYPICAL MALE FIGURE

One of the most famous works of the Argive school is probably preserved in a Roman marble copy in the Museum of Naples, Pl. XXII, Fig. 1. It represents a young man, who has shouldered his spear, walking. His abdominal muscles are rather prominent. In the original, however, which was of bronze, the glittering hue of the metal doubtless subdued what the softer surface of the copy reveals to excess. The modern spectator, moreover, who has seen Sandow exhibit his enormous physical strength, turns to the Doryphoros (Spear Bearer) with high respect for the Greek sense of moderation.

The story goes that Polykleitos made a most careful study of the proportions of the human body, and even published a treatise on the subject. To elucidate his views still further he carved a statue, known as the Kanon (Rule), and there are good reasons to believe that the Kanon and the Doryphoros are identical. If this is the case, the origin of the statue explains its soulless appearance. It is not a personality the artist wanted to carve, but a body; it is not the voluntary movement of a thinking human being which supplies the pose, but the desire on the part of the artist to show the body to its best advantage. No longer represented as starting off to walk like the "Apollo" of Tenea, page 80, the Doryphoros is seen in the act of walking, the right foot in advance. The left heel is raised from the ground in accordance with the greater skill of the artist. In general design, however, the figure is the unmistakable descendant of the early "Apollo" statues, conceived on a front plane and with a vertical center line. There is, to be sure, no visible line in the Doryphoros. He has taken a step, and with it his right side, head included, has moved in that direction; but soon the left leg will advance, and then a corresponding movement will be made to the left. Between these two movements lies the vertical center line. Think of the figure at rest, and the correspondence with the early type becomes apparent. The Doryphoros is really conceived on the front plane

with the two halves of his body evenly distributed. The pose actually seen is but a second thought, in keeping with the greater skill of Polykleitos. Beyond this he never advanced. It is found in all his statues known to-day. The ancients even commented on it, saying that his figures were all as if after the same pattern.

The direction of the head, following the weight of the body, is noteworthy; the Doryphoros is a thoughtless, brainless, soulless automaton. Many modern figures are modeled after the Doryphoros. Clothed in a uniform, with a gun instead of a spear, he becomes the volunteer. But a volunteer thinks his own thoughts, and while he marches in the direction which the captain has prescribed, he looks about him to the left or to the right. This turn of the head, away from the direction of the onward movement, is a touch which an American sculptor recently introduced in her statue with great success. It never occurred to Polykleitos; his Doryphoros was not to be a man, but the body of a man. To-day we are not much interested in a mere body,—we want the man; and it is therefore natural that the Doryphoros no longer pleases. This is more especially the case because the defects of the statue were such that the Roman copyists could, and naturally did, reproduce them: they were defects in design. The beauties of the statue, on the other hand, which consisted in its delicacy of finish, its

surface modeling, and the skill which was shown in its unsupported pose, are entirely lost; for the change of material, among other things, necessitated the addition of the clumsy tree trunk, and prevented the reproduction of the play of light and shade on the polished surface of the original.

The verdict of the ancients that Polykleitos knew how to give to bodily forms an almost supernatural splendor sounds little convincing if listened to in front of the Naples statue, while it gains in probability when one runs one's finger tips over some of the fragments from Argos now in the Central Museum at Athens. Small and broken though these fragments are, they are of prime importance; for through them it has become possible to appreciate the strong points of Polykleitos. He designed a body, any kind of a body, that enabled him to show that every part of the human form can become by skillful treatment a thing of beauty in itself. Its appeal is to the senses and not to the nobler side of men. Little or nothing was left to the imagination; everything was to be seen, and great accuracy, therefore, was demanded. This naturally led to the study of the proportions of the human body. The *Doryphoros* is accurate; its dimensions are true to nature, but only of a certain type of people. It is neither the type which we prefer to-day nor the one which appealed to most of the Greeks. It is too stocky; the large head, about one seventh of the total

height of the body, gives to the figure the appearance of being short. Changes, therefore, were soon introduced, all of which, however, for about a century were based upon the studies of Polykleitos.

A Diadoumenos, which is almost the companion piece to the Doryphoros, is preserved in several Roman copies and one Greek copy. The statue from Vaison, Pl. XXII, Fig. 2, in the southern part of France, now in the British Museum, is probably the most accurate reproduction of the original bronze. It represents a victorious athlete tying a fillet around his head, and is designed in the same walking attitude as the Doryphoros, although this pose is singularly out of place here. The surface finish of the Diadoumenos is, like that of the Naples statue, poor, and its abdominal muscles are also seemingly too prominent. This suggests the value of the experiment, which Overbeck once recommended, of covering a cast of a Polykleitean statue with a bronze coating in order to obtain the effect of the prominent muscles on a surface like that of the original. Until this has been done it is impossible to judge how much of the unpleasant appearance of the statue is due to the copyist, and how much of it must be attributed to Polykleitos. In a few cases such experiments have been made, and only recently a cast of a small statue thus treated has been placed on exhibition in Dresden. The bronze coating has completely changed the appearance of the statue.

GREEK AND ROMAN COPYISTS

The Greek copy of the Diadoumenos, Pl. XXII, Fig. 3, was found in Delos in 1894. It can serve as an illustration of the different workmanship of Greek and Roman sculptors. The Roman copyist was like a machine: he reproduced the original as accurately as his technique permitted; there was no place for the personal equation in his work. The Greek was far more concerned with the appearance of the statue than with its actual dimensions. He knew that half an inch of muscle carved in marble looks different from the same amount in bronze, and deviated, therefore, from the original. The result is less prominence of the muscles, owing to the fuller proportions of the body. This fullness, however, introduces an undesirable factor into the composition, making an almost voluptuous, somewhat lazy-looking boy of the well-trained athlete.

Another explanation of the boy's soft, flabby flesh attributes it to the tendencies of later times, when men preferred soft modulations to the hardness of strong muscles. Either view proves that the maker of the Delian statue introduced into his copy his own personal ideas and preferences. A true Greek was ever concerned with the appearance of things, and cared little for absolute correctness. "As a thing appears to me, so it is," was at all times his conscious or unconscious motto.

One more point in connection with the copies of Polykleitean statues may be mentioned. It has generally passed unnoticed, but when observed is apt to be used as a reflection upon Polykleitos, although it is doubtless due to the carelessness of the copyist. The back of the head of the Doryphoros shows a greater diameter than is suggested by the face. This was a labor-saving device of the Roman stonecutter, who did not care to carve the ears standing away from the head; the skull is therefore broadened and the ears are not undercut. This can only be seen halfway back of the statue from a position which the ordinary spectator would not be apt to take. The Roman copyist, who worked for the ordinary people, as is shown by his lack of refinement and surface modeling, could afford to take liberties with those parts of his statues which were not to be seen. The better bronze head of the Doryphoros, Pl. XXIII, Fig. 2, from Herculaneum exhibits none of these defects, although its ears are even less Polykleitean than those of the Naples statue; they are the swollen ears of the professional boxer, which the coarser taste of a later age had begun to prefer.

STATUES OF AMAZONS

Together with the head of the Doryphoros there was found the head of an Amazon, repeating the type of many extant statues. We know that Polykleitos made an Amazon, and are told that with it he won a

competition over several famous artists, including Pheidias. It has been attempted, therefore, to assign the several extant statues to the different competitors, but with little success. The story of the competition has too much of the character of an anecdote, and the statues themselves are too similar in composition to permit of a classification according to styles. All of them, moreover, Pl. XXIV, Figs. 1-3, exhibit some Doryphoros characteristics, which makes it probable that they go back, every one of them, to a type created by Polykleitos. Whether any accurately copies the original Amazon is beyond the possibility of proof.

The whole series has been divided in three or four types, of which the most important is called the Berlin type, from the statue in the museum in Berlin. The square pillar is a restoration after another copy in the Lansdowne collection, and introduces a motive of support which is little known before the time of Praxiteles, but which Polykleitos may have anticipated. The strong and graceful lines of the figure make an immediate and powerful appeal, and continue to do so even when the unnaturalness of the composition is noticed. The Amazon is wounded; drops of blood are trickling from a cut near her right breast. Weary of the strife and pained by her wound, she has withdrawn to rest. But can she rest as we see her? The striding posture of her legs, so characteristically Polykleitean, is equally characteristically out of place.

Though wounded under the right shoulder she is resting the weight of her body on that side, even raising her right arm, so that the unusual tension of the muscles must greatly aggravate her pain. And yet she appears to be resting! Such a contradiction, such a disregard of the mental state of the person portrayed, is just what we should expect of Polykleitos, or those working along his lines. The body, the visible tangible body, was everything to them; the mind, the feelings of the person, did not concern them. It is true that not all the copies of this type show a wound; but when the cut was not carved it was most probably painted, for it is not likely that a later artist introduced a wound not contained in the original design.

The drapery of the figure, which is carved with much skill, is pleasant to look at. Its real importance, however, lies in the splendor which it sheds upon the nude by means of contrast. The nude is never so beautiful and captivating as when it is set off by a bit of drapery. The garment is pulled up to leave the legs bare; on the left shoulder it is unclasped, conveying the idea that the woman has just emerged from a violent fray. This unclasped robe is not an accident, nor a mere trick of the artist by which to show more of the nude; it is a well-conceived and telling detail of the whole composition. Similarly unclasped garments are found on the Theseion and

on the Parthenon friezes among the most hurried youths. One of the apobates on the north frieze, catching hold of the chariot, with which he is keeping pace, has his garment fallen from the shoulder as the result of his violent movement.

The proportions of the Amazon, which in keeping with the traditional character of her race are rather full, are incompatible with the typically graceful lines of a woman's body. The discovery of these lines, or at least their introduction in sculpture, was reserved for a later age, when they became the most prominent and, to a certain extent, most charming features of a new phase of art. Except for the upper part of the body this Amazon, with her slim though well-developed legs and her muscular arms, might be a youthful athlete.

None of the other chief types of Amazons, the Capitoline and the Mattei type, can compare with the Berlin type in spontaneity and charm. The Capitoline type is a seemingly conscious effort to correct the contradiction between the pose and the wound. The Amazon has shifted the weight of her body to the left, while her arm is raised somewhat less, only high enough to suggest a gesture calling for pity. But pity is ill applied to an Amazon, and we like the Berlin girl the better for refusing to accept it. A little cloak slung around the neck is added, while the short garment, somewhat altered, exhibits less

graceful lines. Its motive, as if unclasped in the fray, has been changed, for the Amazon is holding it away from her wound to prevent its chafing. Her head is bent in the direction of the cut, but she is not actually looking at it, for if she were her head would be turned down so far that her face could not be seen. In sculpture it is not necessary to have the figure actually look at an object,—a turn of the head away from the ordinary and in the desired direction is sufficient to make the spectator understand the composition.

The Mattei type shows a further deviation from the Berlin Amazon. The striding posture with the right leg in advance is preserved, but the wound has been omitted; the drapery is somewhat changed, and the attitude of the arms is such that it has never yet been satisfactorily explained.

Frequent mention has been made of the fragments from the temple of Hera near Argos, Pl. XXIII, Fig. 3; Pl. XV, Fig. 4; page 248. This temple was built soon after 423 B.C. from plans of Polykleitos. Dr. Waldstein believes that Polykleitos was also more or less directly responsible for the more important sculptured fragments excavated on its site by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. He makes a strong point of his case, and it may unhesitatingly be conceded that in these sculptures we see some of the best extant works of the Argive school. Some of the heads exhibit, to

speak with the ancients, an almost supernatural beauty of bodily forms. This is their charm; but it is the charm of physical perfection, of a beautiful face, and not the charm of a noble character revealed in a worthy body. On technical grounds a comparison of these heads with the best heads from Olympia is very instructive. Here as there the profile view is the only one that is satisfactory; the rest is hard and almost unfinished. (Compare Pl. XVI, Fig. 1, with page 188, and Pl. XVI, Fig. 2, with page 248.)

Polykleitos lived to be an old man. He left several prominent pupils who apparently continued his manner of work for a little more than a generation. Then the immediate importance of his school comes to an end; his method has served its purpose. It has taught the Greeks the invaluable lesson of how to represent the human body. The teaching of Polykleitos is like that of an art school: it prepares one for the creation of masterpieces. As executing artist Polykleitos, though a Greek by birth, was most distinctly un-Greek. He began with the "head," and neglected the "heart"; he paid more attention to things as they are than as they appear to be, and never penetrated to the soul of things. His importance, however, in an age when men ran the danger of thinking that heart and hand alone can create the best works of art, is such that it cannot possibly be overestimated. Un-Greek though he was in his work, he prepared the way for Praxiteles and the other great

artists of the fourth century, and enabled them to be among the most Greek of all. Polykleitos to-day may be a favorite with only a few; all, however, even if they feel inclined to criticise him, will be ready to forgive his shortcomings when they understand his mission,—
Comprendre c'est pardonner.

CHAPTER XXI

THE INDIVIDUAL : SOUL AND BODY

Athens had hardly forged to the front and begun to put her stamp of the noblest conception of life upon the world, when the folly of some of her own people entrapped her into a disastrous war. Not fifty years after the last Persian was driven from Athens, the Peloponnesian war broke out. It lasted nearly thirty years. When peace was declared Athens was no longer the mistress of Greece. She never regained her political ascendancy, but neither the war, nor the Roman yoke that followed with the centuries, nor the Goths, nor the Turks, nor any other power has been able to shake her influence over the most refined minds of the ages both past and present. It is not an overstatement to say that nobody is, or ever can be, an educated man who has not come under the ennobling influence of Athens. However we may look upon classical training, the man who does not get it in some form or other lacks that quality which makes of him a man in the truest sense of the word.

The map of Greece was altered — her intellectual superiority continued undiminished. The changes, therefore, that took place in her art cannot rightly be explained,



HERMES OF PRAXITELES
(Olympia)

as is often done, as the result of the Peloponnesian war. Artistic activity was never suspended: the Erechtheion was erected, and the caryatides used in lieu of columns in its south porch; the Athena-Nike temple was built and surrounded with its famous balustrade; while in Olympia Paionios erected a Nike which, though badly broken, still rallies as many genuine admirers about it as any extant statue. In view of such an uninterrupted expression in art it is clearly impossible to hold the Peloponnesian war responsible for the differences in the sculpture of the fifth and the fourth centuries B.C. On the contrary, the differences are such as had to accompany the intellectual growth of the people. Greek art at its best was always the genuine expression of the people's conceptions. When these changed, art could not remain the same.

If this is kept clearly in mind, another view also, frequently advanced, is seen to be erroneous. Pheidias, some people say, had done the best that could be done in sculpture; his successors, aware of this fact and anxious to preserve the appearance of originality, bestowed their whole attention upon the refinement of details for which the mighty genius of Pheidias had found no time. Such a view reduces the artists of the fourth century B.C. to a low level, and *a priori* renders a just appreciation of their work impossible.

The fact is that the attitude of the Greeks had undergone a gradual but complete change toward the

individual. In the middle of the fifth century B.C. the individual does not exist. He is but a part of the state to which he owes allegiance. The state is supreme, and to it every one must subordinate himself. If he does not,—if he begins to raise his head, and comes into prominence on his own merits,—he is a dangerous member of the community, and is ostracized. The state, the people, the world as a whole are studied; the personal emotions of this man or of that man are not considered except in so far as they are characteristic of large classes of people. Such a state of affairs is impossible for any length of time. Perikles could submit to it, but he was as much above the ordinary man as the Zeus of Pheidias was above the ordinary conception of a god; Kreon chafed under it, and Alkibiades did not suffer it. The individual was calling for his rights, and they could not be withheld. In times of great peril, when the nation has to stand up against a common foe, the person is sunk in the community; but under the sunshine of an easy life the conception of individual existence ripens. This took place in Greece, and we can follow it in Athens. We do not know in what kind of house Perikles lived, but we do know that Alkibiades pressed one of the great painters into his service to decorate his dining room. The unwillingness with which this artist complied, for he thought it undignified to place his art at the service of a private individual, and the eagerness with which Alkibiades insisted, show the

transition from the old to the new. This change was bound to come, and it would have resulted even without the disastrous end of the war which left no worthy state into which the individual could feel proud to sink himself. If one were writing a history of Greece and were looking for captions, one might call the fifth century "The State," and the fourth century "The Individual."

Contact with the individual brought contact with his soul, for it is impossible to study *him* without noticing his various moods and the constant strife and truce between his body and his soul. Once realized and deeply felt, such a view clamors for expression. In Greece it readily found it in the art of the fourth century B.C. It cannot be denied that in the grandest works of the preceding century the soul had a place, but it was never the soul of the individual, never its manifestation at a given moment. It was always the imperturbable depth of character which may be compared to that stillness of the ocean of which the poet sings:

When winds are raging o'er the upper ocean,
And billows wild contend with angry roar,
'T is said, far down beneath the wild commotion
That peaceful stillness reigneth evermore.

It is this stillness of character, far removed from the turmoil of everyday life, which gives grandeur to the art of Pheidias; it is the billows on the upper ocean

or the ripples on its smiling surface which account for the living and appealing art of the fourth century. The artists of this age cared little for abstract character, but much for its manifestation under the adversities or amenities of life. The distinguishing mark in the sculpture of these two centuries, therefore, is entirely due to the attention which had begun to be paid to the individual.

The best works created under the new influences are connected with the names of Praxiteles and Skopas. Masters both of technique and of design, they are yet as different as two men of the same age can be. Sunshine and loving thoughts that come with it appealed to Praxiteles; Skopas saw grandeur and beauty in the elements of nature and in the passions of men. His theme was the strife between the soul and the body; the complete, though momentary, truce between them he left to Praxiteles.

PRAXITELES

All the works attributed to Praxiteles are as if bathed in the sunshine of love, and Professor Klein is right when he says that whenever Praxiteles put his chisel to the stone the little god of love was peeping over his shoulder. Moments of peace and pleasures of dreamy absent-mindedness Praxiteles knew how to portray as no one since. Our museums are filled with copies of his works, many of which, it is true, were only inspired

by him, while they were executed by his pupils. But even they show his importance. An intimate knowledge with a few will make us know Praxiteles better than a hasty review of many.

There is, in the first place, the "Marble Faun," Pl. XXVI, Fig. 1. This little satyr has left the company of friends; at the edge of the woods he stands, easily leaning against a tree trunk. The tune that he may have played on his pipe is forgotten. Has the tune perhaps made him forget the present, and directed his thoughts to that fairyland whence we reluctantly return? The boy is at rest: the bones of his left leg are "locked," relieving the muscles of their strain, while much of the weight of the upper part of his body is supported by the tree trunk. His mind is equally at ease. His rest, however, is only the momentary suspension of activity. Let the least sound call the satyr back to the present and startle him, and off he will dart, like a doe, on his long, nimble, powerful legs. And look at his face,—the sunshine playing on it! Watch it and the muscles of your own face will relax. This is not a smile, but readiness for a smile. Without a moment's notice he will burst out in one of those hearty gusts of laughter with which we credit his race,—half man, half thoughtless beast. For such he is; the ears betray him, for all his lovely form. Pointed like an animal's, they seek a hiding place in his tousled shock of hair, but they cannot be hid. They have given him

away and have explained the spell of his appearance. He is not a boy, but a bewitching satyr. The ears revealed it, and now we see it in the leopard skin slung about him, in the lines of his face, in the nose, so beautiful in shape yet so un-Greek, and marvel at not having noticed it before.

Who dares to speak of growing skill? This is mastery, and appears as such in spite of the loss of many a pleasing touch in the copy. The leopard skin at first had a long tail dangling at the side of the leg; the lazy fingers played with it, and seemed to move it to and fro,—a sign of life and of activity which made the stillness of the little fellow only more conspicuous. The surface finish of the statue also is not all that could be desired, being much inferior to that of a torso in the Louvre. This torso, Pl. XXVII, Fig. 2, is so beautiful that Brunn once believed it was the original. He was mistaken, for its finish is uneven and the dangling tail of the leopard is absent. The marble copyists were wise in omitting this detail of the original. In marble the suggestion of the swinging movement of the tail, which had to be attached to the leg in several places, could not be retained. With this suggestion gone the tail became an unsatisfactory addition. It spoiled the outlines of the leg. This is best seen in the unsatisfactory statue in the Vatican, Pl. XXVII, Fig. 3, which is the only copy where the tail has been preserved.

If in this satyr we see the fanciful creation of a strange type, the so-called Apollo Sauroktonos, Pl. XXVI, Fig. 2, represents a boy in forms that came more natural to a Greek. The Sauroktonos is known in several statues, of which the one in the Vatican most resembles the original. Unfortunately it is in such a poor state of preservation that extensive restorations have become necessary. The face is almost entirely modern, and so are the greater part of the right leg and the lower part of the right arm. The original was of bronze and needed no limb to connect it with the base of the tree trunk. In his right hand the boy held an arrow, which made people believe he was trying to slay the lizard on the tree. He was therefore called Lizard Slayer (Sauroktonos), which name has stuck to him in spite of its inaccuracy.

Easily leaning against a tree, and still holding the arrow, a reminder of the pastime whence he has fled, a boy is losing himself in thoughts. In body here, he is in mind away off. So still is he that even a lizard, the shyest of all reptiles, does not notice him, and full of curiosity sets out on an exploring trip up the tree where the boy's arm has met his eye. The lizard frequently appears in Greek art. The ancients had a legend of the beautiful sleeper Endymion, whom Artemis, the goddess of the moon, came down to kiss because she loved him. This pleasant story is the subject of many a piece of sculpture. Endymion is

so peacefully asleep that a lizard plays about him with perfect confidence, undisturbed by Artemis, who approaches with the mysterious noiselessness that characterizes the movements of the moon. Not less quiet than he, this boy, lovingly called Apollo, leans against the tree. He is not asleep but lost in waking dreams, and his stillness is the more apparent since it is contrasted with the nimble lizard.

The "Sauroktonos" is perhaps the best statue in which to point out the great difference between Praxiteles and his predecessors in the conception of the human body. The straight center line has disappeared, giving way to a graceful curve. This curve is not an afterthought, as the deviations from the vertical line were with Polykleitos. It embodies the first and only conception of the figure. No longer tied to the child's idea of man as one of bilateral symmetry, Praxiteles was enabled to catch glimpses of different attitudes expressive of varying moods. One he preferred to all others. It occurs with slight variations in almost all the statues which are attributed to him with certainty, and is the result of distributing the weight of the body between the leg of one side and the arm of the other side, which rests on an external support. The resulting curve is one of grace and ease, well capable of sustaining the idea of effortless repose. It also draws the support intimately into the composition. The tree trunk in the "Marble Faun" is not only an external necessity, but an

integral part of the design, without which the thought of the artist could not have been expressed. In the case of the "Sauroktonos" Professor Klein has demonstrated the importance of the tree as the bearer of the supporting lines. He suggests that one imagine another boy standing on the right side of the tree to correspond to the Praxitelean figure, and notice how the vertical center of such a composition coincides with the trunk. Some copyists have failed to notice this; they have looked upon the tree as the material support, and have spoiled the delicacy of the design by drawing it too close to the figure. This is the case with the statue in the Louvre, Pl. XXVII, Fig. 1, and more especially with the one in Dresden, Pl. XXVII, Fig. 4, where no space at all is left between the boy and the tree.

The surface finish is inferior on all the extant "Sauroktonos" statues, but the imagination readily supplies it; for we possess one original by the hand of Praxiteles himself, and can there study the delicacy of his touch. His Hermes was excavated in Olympia in 1877. It once stood in the temple of Hera, which was the oldest of all temples in the sacred precinct. Its walls were of sun-dried bricks, its floor of clay. When destruction befell Olympia, and the statue was knocked down, it fell on the soft floor and was covered with the dusty clay of the crumbling walls. This accounts for its remarkable state of preservation. It was in antiquity not classed among the best works of Praxiteles,

and received only one passing notice by Pausanias, who said, in speaking of the temple of Hera, "Later they dedicated there some other things, also a Hermes of stone carrying the young Dionysos; it was made by Praxiteles."

The delight with which this statue was greeted is equaled only by the admiration which has been bestowed upon it from the first. From photographs, Pl. XXVIII, Fig. 1, page 262, it is impossible to understand the beauty of its modeling; one must go to Olympia and see the Hermes in order to appreciate the touch of Praxiteles. Words, inadequate at all times to interpret great beauties, fail in the attempt to describe the wonderful play of light and shade on the surface of this statue. In this respect it is a masterpiece, and well deserves the praise which it lavishly receives. But one must not be carried away by one's admiration of the technique. Nothing is less fair than to judge the entire art of Praxiteles by this one statue, even though it is the only extant original. There is justice in the silence of the ancients, for among the greatest works of Praxiteles the Hermes has no place. It probably belongs to the younger days of the artist. The curving line of the body and the tree trunk are there, but the general design of the composition seems to be somewhat crowded, and is certainly less free and masterful than in the "Sauroktonos" or the "Marble Faun," which latter, by the way, cannot be definitely assigned to Praxiteles.

The forms of the Hermes are rather full, unpleasantly full for the taste of some people, and even those who approve of them cannot deny that the sculptor here has come dangerously near the point of the "too much." "There is a taste of the end in the Hermes," some one said who was perhaps a more accurate seer than correct observer. His view, however, has been taken up recently by not a few who have been provoked by the indiscriminate admirers of the statue. But they themselves have been apt to go too far; for after everything has been said, the Hermes still deserves, as the best preserved Greek statue of the fourth century, the full amount of consideration which has been claimed for it.

The statue represents Hermes the Dreamer. On his way from heaven to the nymphs with his little brother Dionysos, he has alighted near the edge of the woods to take a rest. He has thrown his cloak over the trunk, and with the babe still on his arm he grows forgetful of the present. Look at him, and your own eyes will wander off with his into the mysterious distance. The longer one looks the more oblivious one grows of one's surroundings, and, like Hermes, one fails to notice the struggling baby god on his arm. It is in spite of the little Dionysos, whose vigorous movements might be expected to call the older brother back from his dreams, that Hermes revels in utter self-abandonment.

Praxiteles has achieved his great success largely by means of the eyes of the figure, without, of course,

disregarding all the other devices which could assist him in carrying out the intended illusion. *Nolens volens* we look at the eyes of Hermes; we are drawn within their spell, and held there as if in a vise. Try as we may to scan the other features, back we find ourselves at the eyes. Not that the mouth, nose, and cheeks are not beautiful; but they do not hold our attention: they are so much less beautiful than the eyes. It is here that Praxiteles has shown his supreme mastery; the eyes were to be prominent, and to them everything had to be subordinated. The Roman art critics did not understand him; they looked at details and were not concerned with general impressions. They are therefore on record as saying that Praxiteles knew how to make eyes better than any one else, but that his mouths were less good. Less good indeed, if studied by themselves; perfect if studied in connection with the general idea which their subordination was to enhance. A comparison of the mouth of the Hermes with the mouth of one of the Akropolis *ladies*, page 144, is very instructive. The Romans are right: the mouth is less perfect. But let one compare the faces as a whole. The Hermes brings out one definite, vivid thought; the Akropolis figure fails to live before one. The mouth and the eyes are equally good: the impression of the one is counter-acting, if not actually contradicting, the impression of the others. Praxiteles, we may feel sure, knew how to carve as lovable a mouth as his early predecessors;

that he did not do it shows no lack of skill on his part, but an accurate knowledge of the requirements of his art.

The attempt has been made to restore the Hermes, not in the original but in the cast. The restoration, which was made under the supervision of Professor Treu, is widely known and is generally accepted as correct. In it Hermes is holding up a bunch of grapes which he—the teasing older brother—is withholding from the future god of grapes and wine and revelry. This bunch of grapes is an abomination; it calls Hermes back from fairy dreamland, and makes of the vision-seeing youth, whose happy dreams we long to share, a very common bantering mortal. For this reason alone Treu's restoration ought to be rejected. But it also introduces into the composition the idea of the group, which is foreign to it. In this instance popular opinion is correct, refusing to label the Olympia statue "A group: Hermes and Dionysos," but speaking of it as the "Hermes of Praxiteles." That this was the master's own conception is clearly seen from the treatment he has given to Dionysos, who in every respect is executed as an accessory. His form is conventional; his drapery is rough and without the excellence of finish which is noticed on the cloak of Hermes. Dionysos was in no way to detract from the interest which the spectator took in Hermes; and was certainly not intended to share it, as he doubtless does, when by the introduction

of the grapes he becomes an integral part of a spiritless group,—the Teased and the Teaser. The exact meaning of the upraised right arm of Hermes cannot be determined, but we may feel sure that it too was calculated to enhance the thought of the composition Hermes the Dreamer.

By far the most famous of the Praxitelean statues in antiquity was the Aphrodite of Knidos. From all over the world, Pliny says, people came to see her; and so great was her fame that, though many other beautiful statues were in Knidos, their very names were forgotten over the attention paid to the Aphrodite. Kings offered to buy her, ordinary mortals fell in love with her, and poem after poem was written vainly endeavoring to express her wonderful charms. None of the extant copies even attempts to do this, so that the best—a statue in the Vatican, which to judge from ancient coins and descriptions reproduces the general masses and outlines of the figure fairly well—is singularly unable to give as much as an idea of the beautiful finish of the nude, which was the great force of Praxiteles. The modern student is still further inconvenienced by a tin garment, painted white, with which a mistaken sense of propriety has clothed the figure, Pl. XXIX, Fig. 2. Only once the tin was temporarily removed for the making of a mold, a view of a cast from which is given in our illustration, Pl. XXVIII, Fig. 2.

Aphrodite, housed in an half-open shrine on the coast of Knidos, has prepared for a bath. Her eyes are scanning her native element, the sea. The charm of this view makes her forget her immediate purpose and causes her to tighten her fingers on the garment which she was ready to drop on the urn at her side. In the reproduction of this garment the copyist has been very unsuccessful. To him it was but the material support of the statue; the pliability of the cloth, therefore, has vanished before the consistence and heaviness of the stone. One has only to compare this garment with the cloak of Hermes, or better still with the shawl in the hands of a woman from Ephesos, Pl. XXXI, Fig. 2, to appreciate the inadequacy of the Vatican reproduction. The figure from Ephesos is in relief on the drum of a column, now in the British Museum, and is by some, on doubtful evidence, assigned to Skopas. The part of the garment which the woman holds up is so light and airy that the peculiar coherence of the marble is forgotten. One receives the impression of an actual piece of cloth: let the woman open her hand and the shawl will fall down and trail at her side. What has been accomplished here was doubtless also done by Praxiteles, only with even greater perfection. The garment of Aphrodite was held up not by its own massiveness but by the momentarily suspended activity of the absent-minded goddess.

The head of the statue, broken off, has received a wrong tilt in the restoration. It is not a good piece of

sculpture at that, decidedly inferior to another head of the same type in the Kaufmann collection in Berlin, Pl. XXXIX, Fig. 1, and Pl. XL, Fig. 3. The beauty of this Berlin Aphrodite is so great that it gives one a far better introduction to the art of Praxiteles than did the complete statue in the Vatican. Her eyes are her strongest point. With their peculiarly dreamy sentimentalism, or, as the ancients called it, moistness, softness, they immediately appeal to the spectator, whom they hold under a powerful spell.

In almost all the statues of Praxiteles, whether we know them through copies or only through descriptions (about fifty are mentioned in ancient literature), we find the same musing stillness. Ease of mind is coupled with repose of body; there is no struggle, no despair, not even an indication of restlessness on the part of the spirit at being tied down to matter. Perfect peace is the keynote of the work of Praxiteles. He accepts the existing order of things as cheerfully as we all do when we view them under bright sunlight and with eyes of love. But the sun does not always shine, and the time comes when we must face the wild discord between mind and matter. When men are swayed by passion and the height of their emotion finds an outlet in the violence of their bodies, it is soon spent. But when the will controls their limbs, and the pent-up excitement shows only in the eyes and the hard-breathing mouth, or in the heaving breast, then the

storm is at its height and altogether beyond the power of expression by ordinary men. Such scenes, it seems, appealed to the restless vagrant master of sculpture,—to Skopas.

SKOPAS

A man without a settled home, working here and there, he seems to have taken keen delight in expressing what he himself may often have felt. We know too little of him to be sure on this point, but the presumption both from external and internal evidence is in its favor. Copyists were singularly unable to reproduce his work; they knew how to retain the general outlines of a figure, but did not do justice to the fierceness of flashing eyes. This is the reason why no indubitably Skopasian works are known to-day. The first accurate glimpse of his art was had from two heads which were discovered some forty years ago in Tegea, and may be by him. They are poorly preserved, and of such a largeness of treatment, because intended for the high pediment of the temple which he built, that they are unsatisfactory for close inspection. By their means, however, some other statues have been attributed to him, and among them, as the most important, a Meleager. This statue is known in several copies of varying excellence. A head in the Villa Medici is famous for its impressive beauty, a torso in Berlin for its delicacy of treatment, and an inferior statue in the

Vatican, Pl. XXX, Fig. 2, for its almost perfect state of preservation. All these copies, however, are far surpassed in beauty by a Meleager excavated in 1895 at San Marinella near Rome, and deposited as an indefinite loan in the Fogg Museum of Harvard University by Miss Forbes, Pl. XXX, Fig. 1. Both legs and both arms are broken, and although substantial fragments have been found, no attempt has been made to restore them. Among the fragments is a most exquisite knee.

Meleager is the Greek hero of the hunt. In one of the Tegea pediments he was represented as fighting the Kalydonian boar. Here the fight is over. With his short hunting spear at his side and his right hand on his back, the hero stands seemingly at rest; but his mind is actively at work. The parted lips and the intent gaze of the eyes reveal the contrast between the quiet outlines of his body and his restless mind. The eyes, by a multitude of devices, have been sunk in mysterious depths of shadows. The eyebrows and the surrounding muscles are very prominent; the eyelids project beyond the balls, and these latter are actually undercut, thereby producing one more dark line which the gaze of the eyes has to penetrate. The same device of undercutting has been resorted to in the mouth. Back of the lips the rows of teeth appear, and back of them a groove marks one deep plane of utter darkness. These carefully wrought eyes and this mouth make Meleager live and think before one. Let one replace them by

an ordinary mouth and by conventional eyes, and the entire statue sinks back, as does the Vatican copy, to the commonplace.

In spite of some scratches and abrasions the Harvard Meleager shows a delicacy of modeling which is hardly surpassed by the Hermes of Praxiteles. To run one's finger tips over the body gives one the sense of touching actual epidermis and of feeling the blood course under the skin. The modeling of the left shoulder is especially sympathetic; as in nature, one can feel and see the shape of the shoulder blade beneath the bolster of muscles and fat. Side by side with this excellence there are a few signs of carelessness in workmanship which conclusively disprove the authorship of Skopas himself, or any other original creator of the Meleager type. The left cheek is perfect, but the right cheek is cold, lifeless, stony; the left shoulder is full of the most delicate modulations, while parts of the arm below it are very ordinary. Such partial poverty of execution is incredible of the man who conceived the beautiful statue, and thus seems to point to a later adapter. The same is true of the many supports, attachments for eight of which can be noted in different places, and of the use of the grooved drill for the demarcation line of the legs near the abdomen.

The pose of the Harvard Meleager has erroneously been compared with that of the Hermes of Praxiteles. The place of the tree trunk of the Hermes, it has been

said, is here taken by the spear on which the hero is leaning. Such a view is untenable. No one can rest his body on the pointed end of a spear; and it is the pointed end which is still seen between the left side and the arm. The spear, moreover, does not reach up to the highest point of the armpit, where it would have to be if it were to serve as a support. The apparent correspondence in the attitude of the two figures, therefore, is rather an indication of fundamental difference than of similarity. The lines of the body of the Hermes, half supported by the tree, suggest complete rest, while those of the Meleager, entirely unsupported from the outside, are not restful. The pose, far from being an easy one, is indicative of high nervous tension. It supplements, therefore, the impression of an active mind conveyed by the face.

A worthy companion piece to the Meleager is the head of a woman found in 1876 on the southern slope of the Akropolis, Pl. XXXIX, Fig. 3. The appealing tilt of the head and the eager gaze of the deep-set eyes, together with the half-open mouth and the fine finish of the cheeks and neck, make it one of the most beautiful heads in existence in spite of its disfigured nose. We seem to feel the calm resignation of a passionate spirit under trying circumstances.

Even grander in conception is the so-called *Mater Dolorosa* of antiquity [Frontispiece], a seated figure from Knidos. She may be Demeter, whose daughter

Persephone was compelled to spend six months of every year away from her. The body of this Demeter is poorly preserved, but her head, which was carved of better marble, has retained all its original charm. In the peaceful beauty of the face one may perhaps see a reminder of Praxiteles, while the intent gaze of the shadowed eyes seems to recall the art of Skopas.

THE NIOBE GROUP

Such a mingling of Praxitelean and Skopasian tendencies need not surprise us. It was not uncommon in the generations following these men, and is perhaps seen at its best in an extensive group representing the sorrows of Niobe. Pliny said of this group, that it was not known whether it was made by Praxiteles or by Skopas. Perhaps neither of them was directly responsible for it, and a third man, now unknown, who had imbibed much of the art tendencies of both, carved it. Most of the figures of this group are extant only in poor copies in Florence. A splendid head of Niobe, however, in private possession in England, and the torso of one of her daughters in the Vatican, enable one to imagine the excellence of the composition, in spite of its inferior reproduction.

The two gods, Artemis and Apollo, who are taking vengeance on Niobe for her overbearing behavior toward their mother Leto, are not represented. The flying arrows are more unerring since we do not know whence they come. On later sarcophagi both Artemis

and Apollo are often carved. Their presence lessens the conception of divine wrath wreaking its vengeance on helpless mortals, and reveals the wisdom of the maker of our group.

Many touches of deep human feeling he has introduced,—as when a sister flees for refuge to her brother, Pl. XL, Fig. 1, and he forgetful of self pulls his robes to shield her, not knowing that the god has already killed the girl and that she has fallen dead on his knee; or when Niobe, with her youngest daughter in her lap, Pl. XXXI, Fig. 1, turns a beseeching look to heaven as if to say, "Spare her! kill me, but do not harm my girl." The gods, however, are implacable; there is no escape from them. "Whither shall I flee to escape destruction?" seems to be the cry of the daughter who is best preserved in the Chiaramonti collection in the Vatican, Pl. XIX, Fig. 1. The deep gulping folds of her garment show the rapidity of her onward movement, the curving lines of her fluttering shawl tell of the uncertainty of her direction. Hither and thither she turns; soon, however, she too will be struck down, and lie at the side of her dead brothers. But she does not want to die; she wants to live. Her youthful breast and her beautiful body seem made for a long enjoyment of earthly happiness. Her head is gone, yet so unmistakably has her character and her state of mind been revealed in her body that we scarcely miss it. We are almost glad that it is gone, for the storm of passion runs

so high that we do not know how the face could express its proper share of it and at the same time retain the beauty of a noble countenance.

Niobe herself is suffering the punishment which her overbearing character deserves. Her children, however, are guiltless, and the fate they meet is the harder to bear the less it is merited. Perhaps nowhere in Greek sculpture has the dramatic pathos of human agony been more vividly portrayed than in this group. We seem to feel what every one of the Niobids is suffering in mind and body, and are thus brought in close contact with every single individual. The date of this group is uncertain. Some scholars assign it to a late period because of its dramatic interest, others to the fourth century on the strength of Pliny's statement. One thing is sure: the Niobids could not have been made before Praxiteles and Skopas had taught the expression of the individual and his momentary states of mind.

THE TOMB OF KING MAUSSOLOS

The names of these two great sculptors were once more, probably erroneously, coupled in connection with the tomb of King Mausolos of Caria, who died in 351 B.C. Together with several other artists, Praxiteles and Skopas are said to have been summoned to Asia Minor by Artemisia, the widow of the king, who wished to erect in his honor a grave monument of such splendor that it should surpass the most beautiful tombs of

Greece and of Asia. She succeeded so well that to this day every unusually fine sepulchral structure is called a "mausoleum." The original mausoleum has disappeared, and only fragments of its sculptured and architectural decoration are preserved. All the sculptures exhibit, in spite of uneven workmanship, intensity of feeling and, to a certain extent, character delineation.

On one slab, Pl. XXXII, Fig. 1, an Amazon is on her knees, begging for mercy with outstretched arm. The Greek, who is ready to deal her a blow, seems to be seized with pity. His compassion will cost him dear, for another Amazon is bearing down upon him. Mercy she knows not; she will strike him, and her blow will be fierce, because he has been the recipient of supplications from her sister. There is cruelty in the clear-cut lines of her masculine body, in keeping with the traditional Amazon character, and in this case partaking of wrathful indignation at a sister's weakness.

On another slab, Pl. XXXII, Fig. 2, a splendid figure is fury-like driving a Greek to the corner. Escape is impossible, and so he falls back, cowering and vainly endeavoring to ward off the blow with his shield. On both these slabs the spaciousness of the composition is remarkable; the artist has discarded the idea of filling every available space. The sweeping lines of the bodies, bent to their utmost, are wonderfully expressive. Compared with earlier works of art nothing could show a greater contrast than the recoiling Greek on one of



MAUSSOLOS
(British Museum)

these slabs and the Marsyas of Myron, Pl. x, Fig. 2. Before the intensity of passionate representation the value of reserved force has disappeared. The best of the figures of this Amazon frieze exhibit also marvellous skill in the treatment both of the nude and the drapery, page 46; while the loveliness of some of the Amazons increases the sense of cruelty with which the others impress one.

Very different in subject, though similar in passionate feeling, are the charioteers of a smaller frieze from the same building. Professor Gardner describes one of them, Pl. XXV, Fig. 1, by quoting these lines from Shelley.

Others, with burning eyes, lean forth, and drink
With eager lips the wind of their own speed,
As if the thing they loved fled on before,
And now, even now, they clasped it.

Somewhere in or on the tomb of Maussolos there stood the statues of the king, page 286, and his wife. Every inch a king, he stands before us; not a Greek, but none the less a noble personage. A barbarian, to be sure, but a dignified individual. His statue was badly broken, and had to be put together from sixty-three fragments. The statue of Artemisia is even less well preserved; her face is lost, but has been successfully restored, in the cast, by the American sculptor Story.

One of the later creations which show strong Skopasian influences, especially in the treatment of the faces,

is the so-called Alexander Sarcophagus, Pl. XXXIII, Fig. 1, in Constantinople. Aside from the powerful impressions made by the eager hunters and merciless fighters, Pl. XXXIV, Figs. 1-3, the sarcophagus holds a unique place among ancient monuments, because it has preserved to an unprecedented extent its original colors. The æsthetic enjoyment of the monument, it is true, is somewhat restricted, owing to the fact that some colors have faded while others are still bright; as an archæological treasure, however, and as an argument in favor of the theory of the painting of ancient sculpture, this sarcophagus ranks second to none.

In taking one more survey of the sculptures which group themselves about these two men, Skopas and Praxiteles, one sees how the individual in every instance has stepped into his rights, and how it is the momentary expression of his character which has supplied the motive of the composition. Though momentary, this expression is not accidental; it is deeply rooted in the essential character of the person portrayed. If it were not so, its representation would fail to please; for the momentary in sculpture is permissible only if it admits of conclusions to be drawn as to the eternal and unchangeable. It is the application of the *pars pro toto* in sculpture. Hermes forgets Dionysos and goes off into dreams; Meleager has the opportunity for rest and does not rest; Demeter is longing for her daughter;

and the Amazon is ready to avenge her sister's weakness, — not because *once* in the experiences of their lives there was an occasion for such an action or lack of action, but because all these people are so constituted that such a behavior is to be expected of them always, or better still because they are apt to create such conditions for themselves constantly. It is because of this intimate relationship between the momentary and the eternal, and because of the studious, though seemingly unconscious, avoidance of the accidental, that the art both of Praxiteles and of Skopas is far removed from the trivial and the commonplace. Nothing can be simpler than the motive of the little "Marble Faun"; nothing, on the other hand, more indicative of the master's mind than the perfect correspondence of the satyr's momentary state of mind and his real character.

Praxiteles and Skopas have left no records of their views of art, and although their works exhibit many of the principles which their great successor Lysippos formulated in a definite code, one loves to think that the wise selections of both men were matters of instinct rather than of intellect.

CHAPTER XXII

FORMULATED PRINCIPLES; PERFECT SKILL

The names of great men are like magnets,—they gather about them works and sayings of friends and pupils; and after some centuries it has become impossible to distinguish what properly belongs to them and what tradition has added. The biographer is much inconvenienced by such a state of affairs: the art critic can view it with complaisance, for he cares less for the individual who first gives expression to a definite thought than for the thought and the time when it makes its appearance. It may sound like a paradox, but it is a fact, that a truth is rarely formulated while it continues to be an active force, and never at the beginning of its career. Toward the end of its period of influence, when it is threatened with extinction, the man is apt to appear who, looking back over the past, discerns more clearly than any one before the essential principles which have guided his predecessors. He expresses them, and by so doing preserves the image of this dying force for posterity.

Almost all the sayings accredited to Lysippos must be explained in this light. They are convincing only if thus understood. "The principle of my art," Lysippos

said, "is to represent things as they appear to be." What true Greek of the past three centuries would not cheerfully have subscribed to this creed? — except perhaps Polykleitos. As a fling at him Lysippos seems to have added, "and not as they really are, as my predecessors did." Pliny, who preserves this statement, makes Lysippos place himself in opposition to all the older sculptors, but this is obviously a mistake. No one ever wrought figures more carefully "as they appear to be" than the sculptors of the Parthenon frieze. Lysippos, however, who belonged to the school of Argos and Sikyon which Polykleitos had brought into prominence, doubtless directed the last part of the above statement against his immediate and more local predecessors. Almost a century before Lysippos it was said of the great tragedian Euripides that he represented his characters as they were, while others had drawn them as they ought to be. The similarity of these statements alone would suffice to show that Lysippos did not lay down new principles, but simply put into words what had been the guiding spirit of the best works for generations. The conclusive proof, of course, is found in the extant monuments.

Another statement in regard to Lysippos is that he was as great in *constantia* as in *elegantia*. The translation and interpretation of these words have given no end of trouble to modern scholars. They have looked for new principles which he formulated and

which distinguished him from his predecessors, instead of realizing that here again we have probably nothing but the attempt at putting into words the guiding principles of the past. The difficulty is, of course, somewhat increased by the uncertainty as to the Greek words which are rendered by the Latin *constantia* and *elegantia*. The application of *elegantia* to the outer form of a statue, that is to its appearance, is almost self-evident; and since the two Latin terms are contrasted, there is a strong presumption in favor of referring *constantia* to what in literary criticism is sometimes called the "inner form." By inner form is meant the perfect agreement of the thought with the particular mode selected for its expression. In poetry, as is well known, there are subjects which are best treated in an epic poem, and others which just as certainly demand a lyric expression. The outer form of the epic or the lyric may be perfect, may exhibit *elegantia*, but unless it is the *natural* vehicle of the particular thought it is lacking in "inner form," *constantia*, and is unsatisfactory as a work of art. The same is true of sculpture. It is not enough to give to a statue a symmetrical outline and pleasing finish, that is *elegantia*; the whole statue must be the natural expression of the thought which it is intended to convey. The outer and the inner form must "hang together," or, as the ancients would have put it, "stand together" (*constare, constantia*). The Latin passage thus explained.

is seen to have no reference to new discoveries by Lysippos, but to contain a clear statement of principles characteristic of all the best Greek art, and most especially of Skopas and of Praxiteles. The importance of the principle of the outer and the inner form is readily comprehended when once pointed out, and the neglect of it is without doubt responsible for many unsuccessful pieces of sculpture both later Greek and modern.

The work of Lysippos which best shows his adherence to this principle is his portrait of Alexander the Great. Alexander was afflicted with a stiff neck. The muscles of one side were shorter than those of the other, making it necessary for him always to tilt his head. In actual life, it seems, this defect passed almost unnoticed before the dazzling vivacity of the king, but to most sculptors it proved an unsurmountable obstacle. Lysippos, however, made good use of it, and converted it into a most telling device for the expression of the king's character. Alexander was overbearing and proud of his position and achievements, and Lysippos represented him with a sidelong look to heaven, by which he seemed to be addressing Zeus, with these words of a Greek poet.

The world by might is mine, Zeus,
Olympos keep for thyself.

This same look also required the representation of eyes natural to Alexander at all times, but in an ordinary bust out of place,—eyes focused as into the distance


and exhibiting the moist sentimentality peculiar to them. Alexander was so delighted with the work of Lysippos that he appointed him his court sculptor, and refused the right to carve his likeness to all others. Of the extant Alexander busts none, unfortunately, is above the commonplace. The tilted head and the king's shaggy mane are seen, but the telling eyes are lost. It is in fact not even definitely known that any of the copies reproduce the work of Lysippos, for in spite of Alexander's prohibition portraits of him are also mentioned by other sculptors.

Of complete statues of Alexander only three of importance are known to-day,—one in the Louvre, one in Munich, and one in Constantinople, formerly called Apollo. All are inferior copies (two of them much restored), and all have preserved little except the general lines of the original. The statue in Munich shows the king with his right leg raised on a stone, as the restorer has it, or on a helmet in the act of putting on his greaves, as has been suggested by Lange, who sees a characteristically Lysippean motive in the raised leg. It is a pose which from now on enters largely into Greek statuary, and is for Poseidon, whom Lysippos represented with preference, almost characteristic. With one foot on a rock the god pulls himself up tall and straight to pound the ground with his trident. But even this posture is nothing new with Lysippos; it is the conscious adaptation of a design found more than once in the Parthenon

frieze, in groups where the stepping stones are taking the place of the modern stirrups.

Thus far we have met Lysippos only as the clever interpreter of past achievements; in one direction, however, he made a distinct contribution to art. This he did not so much as the successor of Skopas and Praxiteles as in his capacity as head of the Argive school. The Polykleitean dimensions had continued in force in spite of the changes which several intervening sculptors had endeavored, with little success, to introduce. Their failure was probably due to the fact that they had shrunk from abandoning the general ratio given by Polykleitos. Euphranor, we are told, kept the Argive dimensions of the head and the joints, making only the body less heavy. The result was unpleasant, because the head and joints of his statues appeared disproportionately large. Lysippos, it seems, was the first to realize the chief faults of the Polykleitean Kanon, which reproduced the means, as it were, of all measures offered by nature, without noting that nature herself does her best only occasionally. A satisfactory system of proportions, if based on nature, is only possible if it gives the average measurements of the very best specimens and refuses to pay attention to the majority of people who fall short of the standard of beauty. The result of the labors of Lysippos in this direction was an entirely new canon. Compared with the old it reveals a slender torso, longer arms and legs, and a smaller head, only

about one eighth of the total height of the body. A figure based upon these proportions gives one the appearance of height and of nobility, as is seen in a statue in the Vatican Museum, page 296, representing an athlete scraping himself (Apoxyomenos). We know that Lysippos made such a statue, and the Vatican Apoxyomenos is considered to be a copy of his work. The fingers of the right hand with the die, the toes, and other minor parts are restored, and the supports for the legs and the arms are doubtless additions of the sculptor who translated the original bronze into marble. Not larger than the Doryphoros, the Apoxyomenos gives nevertheless the impression of a much taller man. The head no longer adopts thoughtlessly the direction of the leg which is supporting the weight of the body; and the entire pose is one far removed from that limited conception of the early artists which still supplied the motives of the Polykleitean statues. Notice how readily the Doryphoros will return to the primitive position, and contrast with it the several turns and twists of the body and the limbs which are necessary before the Apoxyomenos can be imagined as standing as straight and erect as the "Apollo" of Tenea. The right leg has moved not only backwards but also sideways, and has thus occasioned a rearrangement of the muscles which is as gracefully perfect as it is seemingly simple. The design of the figure implies, on the part of the artist, control over the conception of a body



APOXYOMENOS (Vatican)
After Lysippos

of three dimensions moving in limitless space. The ease with which the right leg may be imagined moving in a circle about the left is marvelous; while the satisfaction of a complete view of the statue, Pl. XXIX, Fig. 3, when it is given a turn on a revolving base, reveals how firm a grasp the artist had of the truly sculptural. This Apoxyomenos is, if one is permitted to stretch the term, the first real statue *in the round*. It is the culmination in technique of the endeavors which began with the earliest "Apollo" statues. The artist who carved it has mastered the technical side of his art; nothing is left for him to learn.

This fact was clearly understood by all the ancients, and is universally accepted to-day. After Lysippos the question, What *can* the sculptor represent? no longer exists; it is only, What *does he care* to represent? Great skill in anything is a dangerous boon; it often leads to thoughtless creations, and is a valuable gift only to him who is man enough to feel and to think before he sets out to produce. In times of halting skill only those people are apt to undergo the hardships of production who feel the urgent need of expressing a well-conceived thought. With ease of workmanship, haste or lack of thought are wont to make their appearance. But it must not be believed that this is invariably the case; for it is not only possible but also recorded in history that technical skill and depth of personality may go hand in hand. The rapid disintegration of national and

religious ideas in Greece after the death of Alexander the Great prevented her from producing a Michelangelo, but not a few of her late creations are comparable to the works of the mighty Florentine.

Lysippos and his immediate followers may be said to have reached the summit of the mountain which the "Apollo" artists had begun to climb. The belief of many that after Lysippos the downhill journey was immediately begun is erroneous. Art broadened on the top and enjoyed a long season of autumn days. Occasionally a sculptor came dangerously near the precipice, or even fell to the bottom, but such cases were rare. Perfection had been won with too much hard labor to be immediately abandoned. Lysippos may mark the end of *unconsciously* perfect art. The end of art was not to come for several centuries.

CHAPTER XXIII

AUTUMN DAYS

After working and waiting come rest and the season of enjoying. Rest for the healthy man is not inactivity. Not even the idiot finds recreation in doing nothing, Mr. Bigelow has said. Greek artists least of all were satisfied to rest on the triumphs of their predecessors; and in spite of the much-abused and erroneous statement of Pliny that at about 300 B.C. art had come to a standstill, the creations of the Greek sculptors continued in undiminished quantity. The quality of their work was so high and varied, and their own number so large, that it became impracticable to group even the best statues around a few famous names. Nor was it possible, as in preceding ages, to mark strong personal characteristics in the creations of any one, man or school; for all partook of the achievements of the masters of the past. A leaning toward Praxiteles in one statue might be offset by a preference for Pheidias in another made by the same sculptor, and men of widely different periods might be drawn to the imitation or adaptation of the identical old master. It is therefore impossible to-day to say whether a statue was carved in the third or the second or even the first

century before Christ. The intellectual horizon of the sculptors of these different centuries was practically the same, and with sufficient application on their part there was no reason why they should not all muster an equal amount of skill. All the works, therefore, of the autumn days of Greek sculpture must be discussed together in one class. It is true that a few of them may be more definitely dated by means of inscriptions, literary references, and historical deductions, but these only go to strengthen the above conclusion.

Indistinguishable from each other, the works of this long period are yet readily recognized from those of the preceding centuries. Statues which owe their origin to mere skill of hand, without pressing into use either "heart" or "head" or both, are inconceivable in the time of Pheidias and of Praxiteles. And even the truly great works of this period possess distinctly new qualities by which they are known, and which not only justify the name given to this age but also refute the theory of its being one of decadence. There is a season of the year when the ripe fruit, with characteristic fullness, commands our admiration, and the variety of changing foliage tries to crowd from our memory the pleasures in the fresh verdure of springing buds. It is a singularly happy season, when a sense of joyful stability is felt after the long months of waiting and watching. The light blossom of the spring has made way for the red-cheeked apple, and assurance has taken the place



APHRODITE OF MELOS (Louvre)

Correct view

of faith in nature's growing powers. Of all the days of the year none are more self-sufficiently beautiful than the crisp, clear autumn days. They are neither full of promise for the future nor teeming with reminiscences of the past. It is to them we may compare the best works of this period; for they exhibit a fullness and a self-sufficiency that seem to deny all preparation and to carry no hint of the hereafter. A sense of confidence marks them in contrast to the faith that can remove mountains. They are, in the truest sense, creations of the autumn days of Greek sculpture.

THE APHRODITE OF MELOS

One of the most generally admired statues of this period is the Aphrodite of Melos, more widely but less properly known as the Venus de Milo, page 300. Discovered in 1820 in a cave on the island of Melos, she was brought to Paris as a present to the king. Now she is in the Louvre, the recipient of homage by multitudes of visitors, the true goddess of love; and at the same time, in the second rôle of her well-known character, the inspirer of feuds, although in this case only among scholars. Who made her, and when? How ought she to be restored? and Who is she?—these questions are constantly asked.

Inscriptions containing the name of a sculptor and fragments said to have been found in the same cave are urged in argument by some, and on account of

their doubtful authenticity rejected by others. One man is struck by her "Lysippean proportions and pose," another by her "Pheidian drapery," and still another by her individual expression. All admire her and would assign her to that period which they believe the best. As long as the autumn days of Greek sculpture were considered a period of decadence, there was no place in them for this Aphrodite. "Let us put her in the fourth century," people said; but they came to grief. The self-sufficient grandeur of the figure finds there no parallel. "Well, then, back to the fifth century!" they shouted; and when everything — pose, finish, dimensions, expression — proved the inaccuracy of their view, they urged a superficial resemblance between the folds of her drapery and some of the Parthenon figures. The folds in a few instances are not dissimilar, but the garments themselves are entirely unlike. The slightest familiarity with Greek costumes shows that the drapery of the Aphrodite is altogether too small to serve as an actual garment. It is suppressed for reasons of design, and is in this respect very different from the draperies of all the Parthenon figures, and even in strong and perhaps conscious contrast to the Aphrodite of Arles, Pl. XXXV, Fig. 2, which with probability is assigned to the Praxitelean cyclus. The correspondence in the treatment of folds, therefore, instead of pointing to the origin of this statue as in the fifth century, argues in favor of a later date, when men with perfect freedom

knew how to adapt and how to combine into one harmonious whole the pose of Lysippos, the charm of Praxiteles, and a bit of technique from the Parthenon. The only time when this was possible was, of course, the Greek autumn days. The Aphrodite is the fruit which with characteristic completeness drives from one's memory past pleasures in the growing efforts of nature.

The correct restoration of this figure was until recently as perplexing as its attribution to a definite period used to be. The front view of the statue, Pl. XXXV, Fig. 1, is the one most generally known. It exhibits the beauty of Aphrodite's right side, and at the same time shows a very unpleasantly straight line and impossible hip on her left. This has led people to believe that Aphrodite originally was coupled with another figure whose outer contours corresponded to those of her beautiful right side. Several figures have been suggested, but none have stood the test; the most formidable objection to all of them being the fact that Aphrodite is too obviously not part of a group but sufficient in herself. In just appreciation of this fact some scholars have suggested a column or a tree or some other object at her side to complete the composition on her left. It is difficult to think of any such object the shape of which would not be unduly prominent. And yet something, it is reasoned, must have been on this side, if for no other reason than to serve as a support for the arms. Both arms are broken away, but there is

not a single place of attachment on the whole figure from which they originally could have been supported. It is therefore clear that they were attached to some outside object, for being of marble they were too heavy to do without any stays. The position of the left arm is altogether problematic; the right arm, Mr. Robinson has proved, crossed the body at a right angle, with the hand held downward. Only in this position does the biceps of the upper arm press closely enough to the breast to make that little muscle appear which is seen over the right breast. It is the consideration of the arms which has made the introduction of an outside support appear to be even more necessary than the æsthetic requirements of the design.

But another and infinitely simpler solution offers itself. It is based upon the appreciation of the peculiar technique of the figure, which is not completely finished in the round, but of excellence only on the right side of a plane erected on a line connecting the right heel with the left ankle. A view of the figure from this side (see page 300) is of surpassing beauty. The unpleasant straightness of the left disappears, the prominence of the right hip is abated, the breasts appear to their best advantage, and the noble profile of the face steps into its rights, while the arrangement of the hair and the dainty lock on the back of the head are seen for the first time. Suppose this was the view intended by the artist, who, to prevent other and less satisfactory

views, placed his figure in a niche or at least close to the wall! The disposition of the arms becomes then a matter of no difficulty, for the background offers ample opportunities for invisible places of attachment. This solution of the seemingly hopeless problem of restoration is so simple that one wonders at its not having been suggested before. It has certainly never before found its way to the front, although it is the only one that enables one to appreciate the statue to its full extent without relying upon outside additions to supplement its design.

The general type of the Aphrodite of Melos has been preserved in several figures. Draped and holding the shield in the museum in Brescia, Pl. XXXV, Fig. 4, she is called Nike; nude and with outstretched arms (restored) in Naples, she is known as the Venus of Capua, Pl. XXXV, Fig. 3, and on the Arch of Trajan she again appears as Nike. Reinach believes she is not an Aphrodite but an Amphitrite, and the English sculptor Westmacott added wings to her and folded her hands on her knee and called her a Peri. The Peri, in Persian mythology, are beings of wonderful beauty and kindness. What the original sculptor, who may have known the Oriental legend, intended her to be, we do not know; but that a Greek who saw this figure of great physical and spiritual beauty, without any attributes to give her a definite character, would have been tempted to call her Aphrodite cannot well be doubted.

And to us moderns, too, especially to those of us who know Greek life and thoughts, no name seems so applicable to this perfect statue as Aphrodite, the name of the most lovable and most reverently worshiped Greek goddess.

THE NIKE OF SAMOTHRACE

Sharing the popular favor of this statue is the Nike of Samothrace, likewise in the Louvre, page 30. She was erected on Samothrace by Demetrios Poliorketes of Macedon, to commemorate a naval victory over the Egyptians in 306 B.C. Coins also were struck, and on them we see Nike in the prow of a ship, blowing the fanfare of victory on a trumpet which she holds in her right hand, while in her left she carries what seems to be a trophy. These were, of course, also the attributes of the marble statue. The marble prow has been discovered, and in it Nike, the goddess of successful battles, seems to be moving onward. Space is nothing to her; she glides through it easily, hardly using her wings, while the breeze is playfully pressing the folds of her garments against her. The head is gone, but one never fails to see in the glorious breasts and in the beautiful abdomen the hilarious joy with which the swift motion through space has imbued her. The figure is best appreciated if one revives memories of a similarly swift motion experienced, for instance, in the prow of an ocean steamer. For the moment the cares of the world

fall away, and one is filled with a sense of masterful confidence, listening to voices that deny the existence of the impossible. It is then that the essence of real victory is felt, which is faith in the success of the noblest ideas.

This was the artist's conception. Success has crowned his endeavors, for he has struck a true chord in every man's heart. Mutilated though the statue now is, it is as well liked by the peasant or tourist who happens to stray into the large hall of the Louvre as by the scholar who goes there to study. The latter often feels perplexed by the arrangement of the drapery, which with its violently twisted folds makes a continuous observation from one point almost painful. Looked at from the front, page 30, the folds make one desirous of stepping to the side; and even there, Pl. XXXI, Fig. 3, they are not restful, for they give one the suggestion of the rapidity with which the figure is thought of as passing out of sight. It may be doubted whether such conceptions of motion properly belong to the sphere of sculpture, but if one accepts them, as this sculptor apparently did, one is carried away with admiration for the skill of the ancient artist.

THE BELVEDERE APOLLO AND THE ARTEMIS OF
VERSAILLES

The same is true of the Apollo of the Belvedere Gallery in the Vatican, Pl. XXXVI, Fig. 1, and the Artemis of Versailles, Pl. XXXVI, Fig. 2, now in the Louvre in Paris. They are masterpieces, and have received tribute as such by admiring crowds ever since they became generally known, about the sixteenth century. They were by far the best of all the statues in existence then, and even at the end of the eighteenth century, when people again began to be interested in Greek art after long neglect, there were no other statues accessible that could be called their equal. Excavations in Greece had not yet yielded the treasures of the earlier periods. No wonder, therefore, that the admiration paid at first in just tribute to these figures soon exceeded natural bounds, and that people, yearning to find in art the embodiment of those high ideals which the Greek studies had begun to teach them, believed they saw qualities in them which they did not really possess. The dignity of the earlier figures, for example, they completely lack. Almost sneeringly the Belvedere Apollo is watching — perhaps the flight of an arrow. Let one look in his face, Pl. XXIII, Fig. 4, and study his features, and then analyze one's own emotions. They are hardly of the nobler sort. The conception of the Apollo is not noble; the execution, however, is of surpassing beauty.

The first sight of him, when one enters the Belvedere Gallery where he stands, reveals it. *Stands* is hardly the proper word,—*walks* would be better. With an easy, noiseless step this figure of ethereal beauty is gliding along. Sunshine envelopes him, sunshine is reflected from his supple body; and the longer one looks the more completely one is drawn under the spell of his physical charm.

The proportions of the figure are unusual; the legs are too long for the short trunk, but probably intentionally so in order to increase the impression of movement. The attention paid to them by the sculptor may be compared with the higher degree of care which Praxiteles was wont to bestow on the eyes of his figures. Both hands are restorations; the right appears to be especially unpleasant, with its big palm and elongated fingers. The restorer, who knew from his studies of anatomy that in nature long lower extremities correspond to equally long upper extremities, carved the hands in keeping with the legs of the figure. This was a mistake; the legs were elongated to create a definite illusion. There was no such end to be served by the hands, which originally, therefore, we may be sure, showed more pleasing proportions.

The Artemis of Versailles, Pl. XXXVI, Fig. 2,—often called by her French name, from the hind at her side, *La Diane à la biche*,—may be mentioned as a worthy companion piece to the Apollo of the Belvedere. In

her case it seems to be certain that she is carved of Greek marble, while of the Belvedere Apollo some contend that he is hewn of Carrara marble. Certainty in such matters is difficult to obtain. She was brought to France under Francis I, but she has been less fortunate than the Apollo in finding a place where she can be seen to advantage, being placed against the wall of a long and not well lighted gallery of the Louvre. In her case it is even less the thought or spirit of the composition which kindles one's own with quickening fire,—it is her body and the movement of her body alone which call for admiration. As queen of the woods she has girt up her garment and bared her softly rounded legs. The breeze blowing the fold from her left knee unveils the loveliness of her thigh, and mischievously tries to reveal what the garment would decently hide. This is a touch as artfully suggestive as it is out of keeping with the conception of a really divine character. The fact is, this Artemis is a goddess only in name, and in reality naught but a pretense for carving the body of a beautiful woman. Her drapery, too, contains more folds, perhaps in the endeavor of suggesting the breezes that fan her, than are altogether pleasing. The museum in Copenhagen possesses a torso of a similar type which shows greater dignity in the treatment of the garment, and thereby suggests that the Artemis of Versailles is not an original but a copy, an idea which is well sustained by the rather poorly modeled hind and the awkward support.

THE LAOKOÖN GROUP

No work on Greek sculpture to-day is considered complete which does not discuss the Laokoön, such is the high esteem in which this group is held. Lessing based on it his essay on artistic principles, which he called Laokoön, and which contains as many valuable suggestions, because they are true, as inaccurate inferences, because they are based on a misunderstanding of the spirit of Greek sculpture which Lessing, together with many of his contemporaries, believed was exemplified in this group. The skill of the artists (three are mentioned) is almost painful in its perfection and realism. One comes upon the group, Pl. XXXVII, Fig. 1, suddenly in the Vatican galleries, and experiences a sense of horror as one sees and feels the pain of Laokoön. It is not the *statue* of the sufferer, it is the sufferer *himself*. If it were not for the cruel sense of curiosity innate in most people, one would gladly turn one's back upon such agonies. The many devices by which pain has been represented need no description: the strained position and compressed abdomen, the heaving breast, the open mouth which yet gives forth no sound, the anguished face,—they all combine to convey the one thing—physical pain. Nor is there a redeeming feature in suggested justice. Those familiar with ancient traditions remember that Laokoön had to suffer not because he was wicked or careless, but because he had done his duty

as seer, and had warned the Trojans. By uttering the truth he had offended some of the gods, who were determined to destroy his city, and therefore sent the snakes to make it appear that he had lied. The thought of the group is ignoble, for it teaches the injustice of God. Unless one has studied the preceding periods of Greek art in vain, one knows that such a subject is fundamentally un-Greek in spirit.

The disapproval of the subject, however, does not dispose of the group, for as an achievement of artistic skill it stands as high as it is low in artistic conception. To judge of it properly one must understand the aims of the artists and their times, which did not always call for the expression of a noble idea, but were incessantly clamoring for the highest exertions in the field of manual dexterity.

The right arms of Laokoön and the boy at his right are wrongly restored; the father's hand should be slightly back of and above his head, and the boy's arm in a similar position. When these changes are made the group is seen to gain in unity, with the attention centered in Laokoön even more than before. The boys are but accessories, of use in the building up of the group, and intended to reflect by their innocent presence upon the injustice of the gods. Incidentally they increase the anguish of the father, who sees them perish with him. Their diminutive proportions clearly relegate them to the position of inferior members of the

composition, while the skill of the artists, who have treated them as such without making the inaccuracy of their smaller scale immediately noticeable, is nothing short of perfect.


The head of the Laokoön, Pl. XXXVIII, Fig. 1, is not an individual creation. If one imagines the snakes dead, and the priest's sufferings at an end, his features regain their natural composure, and reveal their close resemblance to those of a colossal head in the Vatican known as the Otricoli Zeus, Pl. XXXVIII, Fig. 2. Herein lies one of the strongly realistic points of the Laokoön, that his brow is not always knitted; one feels that the forehead can be straightened, and that the eyes can shine with the kind dignity of Zeus.

THE SCHOOL OF PERGAMON

It is just the opposite with the giants suffering defeat at the hands of the gods in the gigantic frieze from Pergamon now in Berlin, page 314. Their deep-set eyes and darkened brows are theirs always. They are, as their features imply, a fierce and unjust race. One shudders at the pangs of pain they suffer, but one turns away from them with a feeling of satisfaction that right has won another battle over wickedness. There is, according to Ruskin, no reason why the ugly should not be represented, provided it is so represented that it makes one hate the ugly and admire the beautiful. This has been done by the Pergamean sculptors.

The discovery of the Pergamon reliefs, which decorated a huge altar, and their importance for the study of Greek sculpture, is an interesting story. Not mentioned in ancient literature, except perhaps once, and referred to in the Revelation of St. John as the seat of Satan, the mighty altar built under Eumenes II (197–159 B.C.) had been entirely forgotten. The reliefs, however, were preserved in the ruins of the city, where the Turks found them. Eventually they were used in the construction of heavy walls. The smooth back side of the large slabs, which are over seven feet high, made an excellent facing of the walls, and served this purpose for centuries, until a fortunate accident in the seventies revealed their identity. Excavations, which were soon undertaken, yielded such large portions of the reliefs that it became possible to reconstruct the altar, at least in part. This has been done in the Pergamon Museum in Berlin, page 314. The accurate date which could be assigned to these pieces of sculpture proved their origin in the Greek autumn days, while their high quality added one more important argument in favor of the continued excellence of sculpture during this period.

There are differences of technique in the several slabs, but the points of resemblance—a kind of family relationship—in them are so many that one readily recognizes all if one knows one. The group with Athena as central figure is one of the best, page 322. She has taken hold of the giant, and although she uses no



PERGAMON ALTAR (RECONSTRUCTED) AND ONE SLAB OF THE ALTAR
(Pergamon Museum, Berlin)



weapon, he sinks before her, and falling receives the mortal bites from her snake. The goddess sweeps on, and before her the ground opens and Mother Earth herself implores her to spare the giant; but Athena refuses, and is already met by her constant companion, Nike, the goddess of victory. The ease with which Athena has conquered the giant reminds one of the often-quoted words of Aischylos, that "all the gods' work is effortless and calm." This, however, is apparently not the case on another slab, Pl. XXXVIII, Fig. 3, where Zeus has to exert all his power to overcome his formidable opponents. One of the most pleasing figures of all is a goddess on horseback, Pl. XXXVII, Fig. 2,—as noble a creation as any of Greek art, and perfect in execution.

To the Pergamon school, but probably to an earlier phase of it under Attalos I (241–197 B.C.) belongs a statue in the Capitoline Museum known since the sixteenth century, and until recently wrongly called the Dying Gladiator, page 316. The figure represents a Gaul. The tribe of the Gauls to which he belongs attacked Rome in 390 B.C., and later attempted to plunder Delphi. On the passes of Mt. Parnassus the Gauls were probably overtaken by one of the violent snowstorms frequent there, and driven back. Badly frightened, they spread the story that Apollo himself had appeared to them and shaken his ægis in their faces to protect his sanctuary. Leochares is said to have made a statue of Apollo to

commemorate this event, and Mr. Collignon suggests, but with little plausibility, its preservation in the Apollo of the Belvedere. The Gauls left Greece, and settled in the northern part of Asia Minor, where they were the terror of the neighborhood until first Attalos and later Eumenes of Pergamon beat them to submission, and they became the peaceful settlers to whom St. Paul wrote his "Epistle to the Galatians."

The spirit of humility and submission has not yet been fostered in the Gaul who is dying in the Capitoline statue. He is a typical Gaul, with his short, shaggy hair and the characteristic torque on his neck. He has fought and been wounded; now he is to die, but he keeps up his fight even against death. With pain in his side and with his blood ebbing fast, he is still controlled by his will, and endeavors to rise. His strength, however, is spent; his muscles are weak, and he cannot straighten his right arm to a position where the *locked* bones relieve them. He is fighting to the end, and when he collapses he will still be fighting,—a typical Gaul.

The statue itself is probably a copy after a bronze original, now lost. Other marble copies of contemporaneous bronze works have been recognized in a number of small figures of giants, Persians, and Amazons. The originals, it seems, were sent to Athens by Attalos to commemorate his victory over the Gauls. Side by side with a powerful giant in the Naples Museum lies a dead



DYING GAUL
(Capitoline Museum)



Amazon, Pl. XXXVIII, Fig. 4, graceful even in death. Hers is a peaceful repose, such as the Greeks desired for themselves and those they liked. She did not struggle to the last, but, when the hour to die had come, she submitted to the gods, and died as beautifully as she doubtless had lived. In her very simplicity this Amazon is one of the most impressive creations of Greek sculpture, and yet she belongs to its autumn days. Is a better proof needed of the inaccuracy of the view that this period is one of decadence?

It is a noteworthy fact that only four or five Pergamon sculptors are named in literature, with no attempt to distinguish them by their works, for it proves the assertion made before, that in the autumn days the names of the sculptors were of less importance than the names of the art centers. Beside Pergamon, Rhodes, Tralles, and Alexandria are prominently mentioned. The Laokoön, according to Pliny, was made by three artists from Rhodes, and the colossal group of the "Farnese Bull" in Naples was accredited to Apollonios and Tauriskos of Tralles. With only one or two works extant of the several schools, it is impossible to formulate their distinguishing characteristics, for the known works may as well be exceptions as exemplifications of definite ideals. The case is slightly different with Alexandria, which was the great center of culture and learning of the autumn days. She impressed her indelible stamp on the literature of this period, and

gave birth to pastoral poetry. Several statues and reliefs owe their origin to similar pastoral tendencies, and are on that account assigned to the school of Alexandria. They are bits of sculpture of delicate finish and pictorial design, but on the whole too trivial and accidental to be of lasting interest.

Works of this kind whose dates are indisputable have caused these autumn days of Greek sculpture to be wrongly named a period of decline. The masses of the people then were, as they are to-day, waking up to the realization of their rights. They shared with the nobler few the privileges of education, but lacked culture, which is the growth of generations. Their coarser taste demanded statues and reliefs in great numbers, while their well-filled purses were a continual source of temptation to the artists. Since subsequent ages were even less capable of appreciating the repose and the dignity of the best art, few copies and few originals are left of the grandest works both of this and of all other periods. But so powerful is the message of these few, so clear its meaning, and so noble and uplifting its spirit of truth that, like the ancient seeker of health at the shrine of Asklepios, the lover of ancient art leaves his studies better qualified to fill a worthy place in life. Truth, honesty, faith, moderation, patience, and diligence are the cardinal virtues of good men, as they are the chief characteristics of the best Greek sculpture.

NOTES



NOTES

PREFACE

PAGE viii. Brunn-Arndt collection of plates . . . or similar collections. The collections of photographs by Mr. W. W. G. Cole, Cambridge, Mass., and by Dr. Arthur S. Cooley, Auburndale, Mass., are very useful.

INTRODUCTION

PAGE xv. Pompeii and Herculaneum. The most accessible account of these discoveries is given in Mau-Kelsey's *Pompeii*.

xv. Lord Elgin. For a full account of the removal of the Parthenon sculptures to England, and for the official documents, see the appendix to Michaelis, *Der Parthenon*.

PART ONE

CHAPTER I

PAGE 3. The fervor of the few. This thought was fully developed by Dr. W. S. Rainsford in an address in the Harvard Union, Cambridge, two years ago.

3. Sir Robert Ball made this remark to Mr. Armbruster, who repeated it to me.

5. The Appeal of a Work of Art. See Part One, Chapter III.

7. overgreat delicacy of . . . Athenian sculpture. See Part Two, Chapter XIV.

7. Polykleitos. See Part Two, Chapter XX.

7. Praxiteles and Skopas. See Part Two, Chapter XXI.

CHAPTER II

PAGE 8. The Mental Image. Professor Emanuel Loewy, of Rome, deserves the credit of having been the first to call attention, in his pamphlet *Die Naturwiedergabe in der älteren Griechischen Kunst*, to some of

the views advanced in this chapter. His treatment of relief sculpture in the same pamphlet appears to be less accurate.

14. generally fell short of their ideals. The one exception is the time immediately preceding the Persian wars. See Part Two, Chapter XIV.

CHAPTER III

PAGE 17. **The Appeal of Greek Sculpture.** Some of the thoughts contained in this chapter formed the substance of an article which I wrote for the *Boston Evening Transcript*, April 19, 1902.

21. **Says Mr. Ruskin.** The quotations from Mr. Ruskin in this chapter are taken from his *Aratra Pentelici, Six Lectures on Sculpture*. (Best edition with introduction by Charles Eliot Norton.)

CHAPTER IV

PAGE 29. **The Artist and his Public.** This chapter has had the benefit of suggestions by Mr. Paul Chalfin, artist and acting curator in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

CHAPTER V

PAGE 42. **spurious anecdote.** Mr. Gardner (*Ancient Athens*, page 248) suggests that the story refers to a contest between Pheidias and Alkamenos for the figures of the east pediment of the Parthenon. The accuracy of this suggestion can neither be proved nor disproved.

42-43. **metopes with powerful figures in the highest possible relief . . . (on) the outside.** The architectural setting of metopes required prominent figures, and doubtless determined the thickness of the entire composition. High relief, on the other hand, was necessary on account of the strong light, irrespective of the projecting triglyphs.

CHAPTER VI

PAGE 47. **early vase painters, who before painting draped figures drew them nude.** This can even now be seen by studying the vases in any good collection.

47. **There are exceptions, — perhaps the Aphrodite of Melos.** See Part Two, Chapter XXIII, pages 301 ff.

47. **Harmodios . . . by Antenor.** See Part Two, Chapter XV, pages 160 ff.



ATHENA AND GIANTS
(From the Pergamon Museum, Berlin)



CHAPTER VII

PAGE 55. resorted to the introduction of an uneven ground in their temple reliefs. The uneven ground occurs on the frieze of the Theseion in Athens, built *before* the Parthenon. The Parthenon sculptors, therefore, were familiar with it, and *consciously* rejected it.

56. *horror vacui*. See Part One, Chapter VIII, page 65.

57. air has been substituted (*viz.*, as background). This was doubtless due to the interest in painting which had grown since the time when Polygnotos came to Athens, about 460 B.C. Warriors coming slantingly out of the background are also carved on the friezes of some of the recently discovered treasure houses in Delphi.

CHAPTER VIII

PAGE 61. since it (the vision) is, however, very erratic. See the footnote in the *Literary Digest*, October 25, 1902, page 520, and the article *ibidem*, May 16, 1903, pages 719 and 720, and any handbook on physiology or psychology.

CHAPTER IX

PAGE 67. Bronze, however, was the favorite material of the Greeks. Bronze preponderated over marble, with the exception of temple sculpture, at the rate of four or five to one. These figures are the result of careful investigations on the part of the students in my seminary course in Wellesley College in 1901-1902. Accurate figures at present cannot be obtained. The preponderance, however, of bronze over marble is proved beyond a doubt.

69. The conclusions which Mr. Edward Robinson has drawn. *Century Magazine*, 1892; and *The Hermes of Praxiteles and the Venus Genetrix, Experiments in restoring the Color of Greek Sculpture* by J. L. Smith described and explained by Edward Robinson (Boston, 1892).

69. remarks recorded in Greek and Roman literature. They are collected in a monograph by Christian Waltz, *Über die Polychromie der antiken Skulptur* (Tübingen, 1855).

71. The figure itself did not reach to the bottom of the slab, but was separated from it by an . . . empty space. This space was omitted in the photograph reproduced in Pl. III, Fig. 3.

73. Practical Experiments. The most important have been made on casts in the Albertinum in Dresden under the direction of Professor Treu, who has published the results at various times.

73. says Mr. Robinson. In the essay quoted above (first note to page 69), *The Hermes of Praxiteles and the Venus Genetrix*.

74. paintings of colored statues in Pompeii. Mr. Edward Robinson tells me that on a recent visit to Pompeii he studied the wall paintings with the view of ascertaining whether statues when painted on walls ever were painted white in imitation of the natural color of marble. He did not find one colorless picture of a statue, but numberless instances of paintings of colored statues. This observation, of course, goes far to disprove any possible objections to the theory of color on statues in Roman times.

CHAPTER X

PAGE 79. Art Conditions before the Seventh Century B.C. Some of the best books treating of this large subject are given in the Bibliography, page 343. The most recent contributions, however, are found in the leading archæological journals.

80. The inhabitants of Greece, etc. The facts on which the account in this paragraph is based are related in the more important histories of Greece. Ernst Curtius's *History of Greece*, although by no means the most recent, still ranks as a classic.

80. The date of the Mycenæan Age. See Hall, *Oldest Civilization in Greece*.

82. suddenly lapsed. I have little sympathy with the recent attempt to argue from a supposed continuation of pottery manufacture as to the continuation of the Mycenæan civilization. The study of vases is to-day overdone. It is in certain directions invaluable, but one must remember that vase painting at best is a minor art.

84. in her sculpture . . . Greece was independent. A generally kind critic of my manuscript wrote: "The statement that Greece was entirely independent of any outside influences is a perfectly untenable one, and the slightest study of the economic conditions of ancient Greece will prove its falsity at once. The assumption of foreign influences in Greek art does not in the least detract from its value. Moreover, the presence of Assyrian elements in Greek art is too strong to be ignored." This critic voices the opinion of the majority of scholars to-day, but it may be left to the student of actually extant monuments, and not of archæological deductions largely from broken potsherds, to judge which of the two views is preferable. Mine is based on faith in the potency of human nature and the possibility of developing the divine spark within one; the other, it seems to me, on the lack of such an invigorating faith.

Oriental influences upon Greek minor arts I do not deny. See page 85.

87. **The earliest Egyptian monuments are the best.** This statement refers to Egyptian *historic* times. The recent excavations of the Hearst expedition by Dr. Reissner and Mr. Lythgoe have unearthed in *prehistoric* cemeteries extremely crude works of art antedating the first dynasties.

I have had the benefit of Mr. Lythgoe's suggestions in the formation of my views on Egypt.

CHAPTER XI

PAGE 91. **bronze was far more extensively used than marble.** See note to page 67.

91. **"tufa" or "poros."** See H. S. Washington in *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. VII, page 395, and Lepsius, *Griechische Marmorstudien*.

94. **gold was an unsatisfactory material.** The gold statue of Miss Maude Adams, exhibited in Paris at the World's Fair in 1900, offered the best proof of this assertion. The glitter of the valuable material made it practically impossible to pay attention to the form.

97-98. **cargo of a shipwrecked Roman vessel discovered off Cape Malea.** The best preserved statue of this cargo is a bronze statue of a nude young man, which is now in the museum in Athens, where it has been restored in the original. The photographs of this restoration have only just become accessible, one of them, page 100, being here reproduced for the first time in America. For the permission to publish it I am indebted to Dr. Arthur S. Cooley, of Auburndale, agent for America of the official Athenian photographer.

The discussion of this statue has not been included in the text of the book, because I have not seen the original, and because no description of the figure has been published that I feel justified in following. The statue in its present voluptuous appearance is rather distasteful to me. I cannot help thinking that its full proportions are due to slight inaccuracies on the part of the restorer. The bronze was badly broken; many parts were missing, others bent out of shape. Even a fraction of an inch added all round to the original proportions can readily account for the unpleasant appearance of the restoration. The modeling of those parts which according to official accounts are restored looks in the photographs so decidedly inferior to the well-preserved portions of the breast that I am inclined to blame the restorer for what I do not like in the statue. This view I express the more confidently since the finely modeled parts, the tilt of the head, and the graceful gesture carry definite reminders of the best Greek art.

The gesture is a peculiar one, not known in any other Greek figure. It is now generally explained as a *stationary* gesture: the person represented held an object in his extended hand. The position of the fingers, if

this view is correct, indicates that the object was spherical in shape. What the object was is not known. Formerly the gesture was believed to be *transitory*, the sweeping gesture of an orator, or perhaps of the patron god of orators, — Hermes Logios. This view, although it has been discarded by most as incompatible with the peculiar position of the hand, I believe to be more nearly correct than the other. The "chorus" in Mr. Richard Mansfield's production of *Henry V* used an almost identical gesture in the description of distant scenes which it was desired to place vividly before the spectators.

To return to the unpleasantly full proportions of the statue, I may mention another possible explanation. The later Greek and Roman taste often took more pleasure in the full development of sensuous bodies than in the sparser proportions characteristic of an earlier age. The Delian copy of the Diadoumenos, Pl. XXII, Fig. 3, is best explained as carved under these influences. The bronze figure from the sea also may owe its origin to them and be the "portrait" of a body of an indulging *bon vivant*. That it bears in many ways strong resemblances to statues assigned to Skopas (fourth century) is no valid objection to this supposition, because Greek artists of the autumn days (Part Two, Chapter XXIII), or even of a later period, were well able to adopt some of the characteristics of an earlier school.

Dr. Waldstein, in an article which has just come to my notice (*The Illustrated London News*, June 20, 1903), agrees with me as regards the gesture of the figure, but comes to a different conclusion as to the artistic value of the statue in its present appearance. He confesses to not having seen the original, and since he too is compelled to draw his conclusions from photographs, the credit due to his view as to that of a well-known authority is not strengthened by being founded on personal observation. The best account of the statue is given by Dr. Arthur S. Cooley in *Records of the Past*, July, 1903, pages 207-213. Those who admire the statue in its present state will be interested to learn that the entire statue has been covered with a thick layer of paste to conceal the rivets, seams, and joints and has been artificially colored to look like a genuine bronze statue. The surface modeling of the statue is therefore not Greek but modern; *not* by Skopas or by Lysippos, as has been said, but by Mr. André, whose office is that of "restorer of works of art" in Paris.

98. *pistol practice by the Turks*. This vandalism was brought to an end by Lord Elgin, who at the loss of his private fortune saved what could be saved. By removing the Parthenon sculptures to England he helped to arouse the interest of Europe and of America in little Greece, and thus was instrumental in bringing about the liberation of Greece from the Turkish yoke.

PART TWO

CHAPTER XII

PAGE 103. The word "Daidaleian." When the statuette here referred to was acquired for the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Mr. Edward Robinson asked me to investigate the meaning of the inscription. My conclusions are published in substance in his report as curator of the department of classical antiquities, 1899, pages 27 and 28.

109. series of statues excavated in Athens. For their discussion see Part Two, Chapter XIV.

118. The statue and the base . . . do not belong together. I am well aware of the fact that this view is not generally accepted. From photographs the point cannot be proved. The demonstration on the original, however, by Professor Wolters in the museum in Athens, has convinced me beyond the shadow of doubt.

119. legs in profile and the face *en face*. The same twist occurs in a modern masterpiece, Mme. Lebrun's "Girl with Muff." The only difference is that Mme. Lebrun's skill has been sufficient to hide the technical device.

122. Additional works, described, with full bibliography added, by Edward Robinson, Catalogue of Casts, Boston Museum, Nos. 6, 7, 34, 36, 39, 125-133.

CHAPTER XIII

PAGE 125. unacquainted with the principles of relief. For these principles see Part One, Chapters V, VI, VII, and VIII. In the discussion of these Spartan tombstones Professor Loewy, in his pamphlet on the "Naturwiedergabe," pages 20 ff., is mistaken; he considers them to be among the best instances of early relief sculpture.

128. thought of as the one back of the other. The same arrangement is seen on the "Ino-Leukothea" relief, Pl. I, Fig. 4.

130. where the baby is approaching her mother. The arm itself is a restoration, but its correctness is attested to by the fracture of the background where the arm had been attached.

132. The pictorial element in the best Greek reliefs is absent. See also Part One, Chapters V-VII, on the principles of relief sculpture, and especially pages 54 and 55 and notes to pages 55 and 57.

134. relief from Thasos. My account of this relief is based on a catalogue description which I wrote three years ago together with my friend,

Mr. G. C. Hirst. Some of his happy expressions I have ventured to retain in the text.

140. "Apollo" of Tenea. See page 80 and Part Two, Chapter XII.

142. Such a device was in constant use with the Parthenon sculptors. See Iris, east frieze of the Parthenon, Pl. I, Fig. 2, and Part One, Chapter VI, pages 50-51.

143. Additional works described, with full bibliography added by Edward Robinson, Catalogue of Casts, Boston, Nos. 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13-16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33.

The grave relief in Naples, No. 26, which Mr. Robinson discusses in this connection, belongs, I believe, to a later age.

CHAPTER XIV

PAGE 144. For the recent discovery of statues in Athens see the leading archæological journals. They are described in the large official catalogue of the museums in Athens. The abridged French translation of this catalogue is almost useless.

These statues having retained many traces of paint cannot be reproduced in casts, because the process of making a mold would obliterate the paint. A colored plate of one of them is added as a frontispiece to Collignon's *Histoire de la Sculpture Grécque*. It is said to be an accurate copy of the statue as it looked when it was discovered. When I saw the statue a few years ago it looked very different.

146. The entire series has recently been classified. In an address before the American Institute of Archæology, reported in the *American Journal of Archæology*, Vol. VI, No. 1 (January, 1902), pages 51 f.

The attempt has been made by some scholars to assign the largest Akropolis figure to Antenor, but the only grounds for such an attribution are that the statue is colossal and that the base is so also. The fractures of both pieces are such that it is impossible even to guess whether they once belonged together. From other finds—I remind the reader of the colossi of Naxos, and of the Athena from the pediment of the Peisistratos temple on the Akropolis of Athens—it appears that colossal statues were not rare before the Persian wars. It is therefore rash to conclude from the size of the statue and of the base that they once belonged together. It is still rasher to judge from the appearance of the statue as to the style of Antenor, and on the ground of this assumed style to deny his authorship of the Tyrannicide group (Part Two, Chapter XV, pages 160 ff.). There is less disparity between this group and the Akropolis figures than there is between the male figures of the temple of Aigina and the Athena standing

between them (Part Two, Chapter XVI). In order to prove the group to be altogether different from the one by Antenor, other arguments than the one based on his assumed "Akropolis" style must be advanced.

151. The close intercourse . . . between the different art centers in Greece. See Part Two, Chapter XII, pp. 104 ff.

154. The straight cut across. It appears also on the mask of a bearded warrior from Mycenæ, Tsountas and Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age*, Fig. 35.

155. a "cupid's bow" (viz., mouth). For a very similar mouth see the head of a youth from the Akropolis of Athens, Gardner, *Handbook*, page 189, Fig. 38.

155. exquisite mouth. The current explanation of the "archaic smile" as a conscious endeavor to make the figures look pleasant is conclusively disproved by the fact that the so-called smile rarely occurs on reliefs where the heads are seen in profile. If the sculptors desired to enliven their compositions by *smiling* faces, they would have represented the smile everywhere, and not almost exclusively in figures in the round.

CHAPTER XV

PAGE 161. as yet unpublished acquisition of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. This piece was sold to the Boston Museum with the right of publication reserved; and this right, as I understand, has not yet been relinquished or made use of.

162. The Restoration of Ancient Statues. The habit of restoring figures, Professor Reinach, the great French archæologist, has recently proved, dates from the time of Michelangelo, when the pope, tired of seeing broken arms and legs about him, asked this sculptor what could be done to make his pleasure in his collections more satisfactory. For the thoughtless and indiscriminate habit of restoring figures according to the likes or dislikes of owners Michelangelo is, of course, not responsible. If a collector had an Apollo but lacked a Hermes, the next torso which he acquired was restored as a Hermes even if it was another Apollo. All the old collections in Italy are full of such inaccurate "restorations." Outside of Italy only the Albertinum in Dresden, most of the statues of which were bought in Italy, is rich—or until recently was rich—in such incongruities; for even there the untiring labors of the director, Professor Treu, have begun to bring order out of the chaos by removing from the statues all those parts which are clearly inaccurate additions.

165. improvements which Kritios and Nesiotes introduced. One of the four so-called Farnese athletes (Brunn-Arndt collection, No. 331), resembling the Harmodios figure, is by some believed to be a copy of the original statue by Antenor.

171. **heads of the Discus Thrower.** The head on the London statue is antique, and probably belongs to the statue. It was broken off and badly damaged on the nose, lips, and chin. The Vatican head is modeled after it. Both heads have been wrongly attached to the statues. Judging from photographs, the London head, especially in the treatment of the hair, is not unlike the Lancelotti head, which was not broken from the statue, it is said, when the statue was found in 1781 on the Esquiline in Rome.

172. **The argument of Dr. Waldstein.** See *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, I, page 168, and II, page 332.

175. **Charioteer of Delphi.** Published by Mr. Homolle, the director of the French excavation in Delphi, in the *Monuments Piot*, IV, pages 169 ff., Pl. XV and Pl. XVI. Our illustration, Pl. XI, Fig. 2, is taken from the French publication. The statue is described by Edward Robinson in the supplement to his catalogue, No. 85.

177. **Additional works described, with full bibliography,** by Edward Robinson, Catalogue, Nos. 64, 84, 86, 87.

CHAPTER XVI

PAGE 178. **whose hair is blue.** Blue was the color that showed when the figure was found. It is impossible to determine the original appearance of the Typhon, because other colors, now lost, *may* have been superimposed on the blue. From comparison, however, with other works belonging to the same stage of artistic advance, I believe the now visible colors to have been substantially the ones which the artist intended should be seen.

179. **Tufa.** Tufa and poros, although not necessarily the same material (see note to page 91), are both soft stones, offering few obstacles to the untrained sculptor.

181. **No sculptors before the Parthenon.** I might have added "and since"; for no other Greek pediment, and to my knowledge not one of the many Renaissance and modern pediments, has been well filled. The modern sculptor dislikes the submission to architectural restrictions, believing his genius will develop better if unhampered. This is not always true. Under pressure the best work is done. Joint work with an architect, if thoughtfully done, is good for every sculptor. It will, moreover, greatly benefit the general public, whose æsthetic sense to-day is, or at least often ought to be, offended by monuments where statues good in themselves are placed in unbecoming niches or surrounded by ill-adapted colonnades.

188. **summed up by Mr. Robinson.** Catalogue of Casts, page 52.

189. **The large central figure of the east gable.** In the arrangement of the figures on the pediment (gable) I follow Professor Treu. There are

several other arrangements, but the latest arrangement by Treu is, without the shadow of a doubt, the best.

200. **The Olympia sculptors.** Pausanias mentions Alkamenes and Paionios. There are, however, grave doubts as to the accuracy of his statement, and since for our purposes it is of little importance to know who *perhaps* carved the pediments, we may leave the discussion of this matter to others.

201. In connection with this chapter the metopes from the temple of Zeus in Olympia may be studied, and, together with them, statues like the so-called Giustiniani Hestia, Pl. XL, Fig. 4, which shows a similar treatment of the drapery. Other statues belonging here are reproduced in the Brunn-Arndt collection, Nos. 42, 122, 175, 229, 261-263, 294, 295, 302-305, 321, 357, 382.

CHAPTER XVII

PAGE 206. and would recover." These translations are quoted from Stuart Jones, *Select Passages from Ancient Writers*.

208. stories . . . which have come down to the present day. The inaccuracy of these stories I tried to prove in an address prepared for the meeting of the Archæological Institute of America (December, 1902) and given in abstract in the *Archæological Journal*. I there submitted an explanation of how these stories could have started. The address in substance was as follows:

Most modern writers tend to believe in the guilt of Pheidias, and it therefore becomes a duty to clear him, because it is impossible to believe that Pheidias correctly understood the gods and at the same time was willing to steal the sacred material of which he was bidden to make their statues. The several stories do not agree, some saying that he was put to death in Athens, others that he escaped to Olympia, and after having made the Olympian Zeus there was again accused and executed on the spot. This latter version is obviously false, for aside from the fact that the Eleans would not have intrusted the statue of the national god to an escaped convict, the time is too short between 438 B.C. and his death to create a work of such tremendous dimensions. The descendants of Pheidias, moreover, received unusual honors in Olympia down to the latest times, while his own workshop was preserved and shown to visitors as one of the most sacred spots of the place. The Zeus, moreover, was probably made before the Athena Parthenos, because the temple was fully completed by 457 B.C., when Pheidias already enjoyed a reputation as sculptor of chryselephantine statues; for during the earlier period of his activity he had made, among other famous statues, one of gold and ivory for the people of Pellene in Achaia.

If the stories of his dishonesty in Olympia, therefore, are utterly false, the presumption is that those referring to Athens are also groundless, and this is the more likely to be the case, since they never detracted from the high esteem in which he was held by posterity. But how could such stories grow up, the most skeptical

may be tempted to ask, if they are founded on no actual occurrences? After the lapse of two thousand years it is impossible to answer this question with absolute certainty, but it is helpful to note, in the first place, that the accusations are contained only in writings of men who lived generations after Pheidias, and second, that an explanation of how these stories grew in later times may be found in a grammarian's note to one of the plays of Aristophanes. These grammarians often quote earlier writers in part verbatim. This particular one, who says he is quoting Philochoros, a writer of about 280 B.C., after giving the story of the accusation probably correctly, uses the word *φυγών*, which means either "he escaped" or "he was banished." Ancient manuscripts are, and at all times were, far from accurate, and the loss of a few letters or of a prefix is of such frequent occurrence that no textual critic hesitates to restore them, if required by the context, provided that there are no fatal objections. It is therefore not doing violence to the text here if one assumes that the little word *ἀπο* was lost before *φυγών*. The original word then was *ἀποφυγών*, meaning "he was acquitted." If we go on the assumption that an original authority, used by Philochoros, related the story of the accusation, closing by saying "Pheidias was acquitted" (*ἀποφυγών*), it is not difficult to see that later historians, basing their accounts upon his, and finding in his manuscript a corrupted *φυγών*, would endeavor to explain the word. This could be done either by restoring the lost *ἀπο*, or by assuming that one or several sentences had dropped out containing mention of the place to which Pheidias "escaped." Everybody knew that Pheidias had worked not only in Athens but also in Olympia, and it was not difficult for the gossiping historians of later times to put the two things together and to *rewrite* the sentences which, as they believed, had been lost. One man wrote them in one way, another in another; and this accounts for the different stories, varying considerably, that have come down to the present day. The inaccuracy of all these rewritten stories is the more patent as the charge of theft, according to Plutarch, was not proved, because "Pheidias on the advice of Perikles had from the beginning arranged the gold on the statue in such a fashion that it was possible to take it off and determine its weight; and this Perikles bade his accusers do."

208. brilliant discovery of Professor Furtwängler. It is published in full in Furtwängler's *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*. The arguments are so cogent that I fail to see the grounds on which so many archæologists have refused to accept them. Professor Gardner's reply in his *Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, pages 265-266, is based on a complete misunderstanding of the ancient passages adduced by Professor Furtwängler. Furtwängler reasons that there was one statue of Athena by Pheidias known in antiquity for its beauty, and called "the beautiful," as told by Pliny (*N.H.* 34. 54), and that the most beautiful Athena statue by Pheidias was the Lemnian according to Lucian (*Imag.* 4), who mentioned especially her cheeks and other parts of her face. When, therefore, Himerios (*Orat.* 21. 4) spoke of a beautiful Athena by Pheidias, on whose cheeks he felt obliged to remark, Furtwängler correctly followed Overbeck (*Schriftquellen*, 761), who believed

Himerios was speaking of the Lemnian. Nobody had ever seriously attacked Overbeck's view, but when Furtwängler began to draw his conclusions then many of his colleagues turned doubting Thomases.

Furtwängler refers the Himerios passage to the Lemnian Athena, because it gives an account of a most beautiful Athena by Pheidias, mentioning especially her cheeks, and *not for* the reason given by Gardner. He then proceeds to draw his conclusions from other remarks of Himerios concerning the statue, namely, that it was bareheaded, and on the strength of this fact discovers a copy of the Lemnian in the Bologna head. How Mr. Gardner can ridicule this whole argument by saying, "To state that the statue referred to in this passage must be the Lemnia because the Lemnia was bareheaded, and at the same time to quote this passage as the only authority for the statement that the Lemnia was bareheaded, is very like arguing in a circle," is astonishing. Altogether incomprehensible, however, is his further statement that "the statue of Athena referred to [by Himerios] is called 'the Parthenos'; and this was the name especially applied to the gold and ivory statue that stood in the Parthenon." This statue in the Parthenon, although mentioned in ancient literature forty-six times, according to Overbeck's *Schriftquellen*, Nos. 645-690, is *only once*, by the Scholiast to Demosthenes, called the Parthenos. The practice, therefore, of calling the statue exclusively by this name is modern. There is, finally, no reason whatsoever to translate τὴν παρθένον of the Himerios passage as a proper name and to write it with capitals as Mr. Gardner does. Himerios, for rhetorical reasons, disliked the repetition of τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν one line back, and used τὴν παρθένον, the virgin, as a synonym.

Mr. Gardner's arguments against Professor Furtwängler's theory are therefore altogether invalid. In a note prefaced to the second part of his *Handbook*, he apologizes for a minor mistake in his previous note, showing a desire to be fair. It is, therefore, especially regrettable that he has permitted such untenable and unfair, because wrong, statements to remain in his book, where they cannot but do much harm.

210. ADDITIONAL WORKS. The Farnese Diadoumenos in the British Museum (Robinson, Catalogue of Casts, No. 103) is perhaps correctly assigned to Pheidias. It is certainly very different from the copies of the statue by Polykleitos, to whom it used to be attributed.

For copies of the Athena Parthenos see Robinson, Catalogue, Nos. 412-414, and Furtwängler, *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*, in the chapter on the Lemnian Athena.

CHAPTER XVIII

PAGE 211. For questions of fact concerning the Parthenon refer to Adolf Michaelis, *Der Parthenon*. For an excellent bibliography see Robinson, Catalogue of Casts, pages 151-152.

211. Perikles decided. See Plutarch's *Life of Perikles*.

212. one sculptor made the designs . . . , while others were engaged to execute them. See building inscriptions from Epidauros, in part translated by Mr. Gardner, *Handbook*, page 372.

215. whisking tail. The tail itself is carved under great limitations of space.

215. peculiarity of human vision. Cf. Part One, Chapter VIII.

218. Harmodios. Pl. V, Fig. 2.

218. The impression . . . of disjointed slabs . . . is different. Cf. Part One, Chapters V, VI, and VII, on the principles of relief sculpture.

219. It is not necessary to mention all the devices. By one of the devices which I have not discussed in the text the great differences in size between the mounted horsemen and the standing boys are cleverly disguised. This is done by preventing an immediate comparison. To the (spectator's) right of the boy, page 38, a horseman is seen in profile, while the boy himself stands in full front. The one stands erect; the other sits on his horse, engaged in curbing him, in a crouching position. The standing boy is a figure commanding attention; the other sinks into the background as one of the many interesting horsemen. The only parts of their bodies that in a quick survey of the frieze challenge comparison are the lower limbs, and they are not more dissimilar in size than can be found with people of the same class. The lower limb of the rider, however, is entirely out of proportion to the rest of his body. This the artist trusted would pass unnoticed, for he had designed the lines of his composition to carry the eyes of the spectators from right to left, and not up and down, and he had by means of another device guarded against detection even if the spectators should swerve from the horizontal line. The parts of the horseman's body are growing smaller *gradually* from the lower limbs to the head. The transition is cleverly disguised by the thigh, which may appear to be *fore-shortened* in perspective. Perspective, finally, — that is, the fact that the rider is farther away than the standing boy, — may also account for the smaller size of his entire figure. In the general design of their composition the Parthenon sculptors did not admit perspective, or, in other words, introduce pictorial elements; but in carrying out the illusions which the practices of low relief demanded they were not unwilling to make use of the most interesting helps that perspective offered.

219. Panathenaic festival. This festival was celebrated annually. Once in four years, however, it was celebrated with special pomp and called the "Great Panathenaic Festival."

224. Olympia sculptor . . . on the west pediment. Part Two, Chapter XVI, pages 193 ff.

225. one of the last boys on the west frieze, page 38.

230. rank among the great masterpieces. Plutarch's high praise for the Parthenon included not only the sculptured decorations of the building, but also the fluted columns, the tiles of the roof, and all the other parts of the temple. Single statues or groups, small reliefs, and large buildings, as such, were praised for their art. Their friezes or similar sculptures were rarely considered worthy of mention among the greatest masterpieces.

230. For additional temple sculptures see Robinson, Catalogue of Casts, No. 108, frieze of the Theseion; No. 424, frieze from Phigaleia; No. 490, frieze of the temple of Athena Nike Apteros; Nos. 491-497, reliefs from the balustrade of the temple of Athena Nike Apteros; and No. 504, frieze of a tomb from Gyölbashi in Lykia.

CHAPTER XIX

PAGE 231. the attempt . . . to identify, for instance, the colossal statue of Athena in the École des Beaux Arts in Paris. For an account of this statue and bibliography see Robinson, Catalogue, No. 450.

232. relief now in Madrid. Good account in Gardner's *Ancient Athens*, pages 306 ff.

233. Kekulé von Stradonitz. *Jahrbuch d. k. deutschen Instituts*, Vol. V, pages 186 ff.

236. Even his back is carved with great skill. Said Ernst Rietschel:

It has always filled me with admiration that the figures of these pediments show the same perfection in the back as in front. The artist knew, if once the work had left his hands and his workshop, no human eye could penetrate to where his love and care had created and fostered the highest charms. . . . It was a truly divine impulse that drove him. . . . The flowers blooming on lonely cliffs that cheer no human eye are yet as perfect and as complete as the most exquisite plants in your well-kept garden.

237. the "Three Fates." To the long list of hypothetical names of these figures (see Michaelis, page 165) must be added the poetic interpretation of two of these women by Dr. Waldstein, as "the sea reclining in the bosom of the land."

237. Demeter. For another seated Demeter of a century later see Demeter of Knidos, frontispiece.

240. **the moon is driving her chariot.** Formerly it was thought that the moon was riding her horse into the sea. Recently, however, remains of the other horses of the quadriga have been found on the pediment. See Gardner, *Ancient Athens*, page 308, note 1.

243. **outrageous nose.** The wrong notion that the Greek profile presented a straight line, with no break between the forehead and the nose, has continued to our day. Excepting works of secondary or even less importance, the perfectly straight profile is unknown in Greek art. It was introduced by the imitators of the antique, who had noticed that the ancients endeavored to reduce the unpleasant break at the root of the nose to a minimum. The beauty and vigor of a finely modeled Greek profile cannot be reproduced by the immovable emptiness of a straight line.

244. **principle . . . of suggesting more.** For the principle of suggested lines see Part Two, Chapter XII, page 107, and Chapter XIII, page 134.

245. **Poseidon struck the rock.** To this day a deep hole on the Akropolis under the north porch of the Erechtheion is shown as the place where Poseidon struck the rock.

246. **their horses.** The chariot of Poseidon was probably drawn not by horses but by hippokampoi, — mythical animals, half horse, half fish.

247. For additional works see Robinson, Catalogue, Nos. 417-419, copies of statues on the west pediment of the Parthenon; and Nos. 498, 499, the "Nereid" monument.

CHAPTER XX

PAGE 248. **Polykleitos of Argos.** Pliny (*N.H.* 34. 55) says, of Sikyon.

249. **Dr. Waldstein in his recent essay on Polykleitos.** In the official publication of the American excavations at the Argive Heraion.

249. **Doryphoros (Spear Bearer).** For the relief of a Doryphoros in the museum in Argos see Robinson, Catalogue of Casts, No. 101.

254. **tendencies of later times.** These may also account for the appearance of the new statue, page 100.

255. **Statues of Amazons.** The literature on these statues is copious; for condensed bibliography see Robinson, Catalogue, Nos. 97 and 98, and Overbeck, *Griechische Skulptur*, Vol. I, notes on pages 527 ff.

260. **Polykleitos lived to be an old man.** The tradition that he like Pheidias and Myron had been a pupil of Ageladas (see page 207) was once discredited, because Polykleitos was believed to be much younger than Pheidias, but it has gained in probability by the discovery of the Oxyrrhynchos papyrus in Egypt, by which he is seen to have been active as a sculptor as early as the fifth decade before Christ, and perhaps even earlier. The temple of Argos belongs to his later years.

261. For additional works see Robinson, Catalogue of Casts, No. 113, the so-called Idolino, and Brunn-Arndt, Pls. 84 and 323.

For grave monuments of the fifth century before Christ, see Robinson, Catalogue, Nos. 453 ff.; for votive reliefs of the same period, *ib.*, Nos. 480 ff.

CHAPTER XXI

PAGE 262. classical training. The prevalent neglect of classical training is one of the most formidable sources of danger in the educational world. Our intellectual life is rooted in and derived from the classical achievements. It is impossible to understand the present without a knowledge of the past. The past, on the other hand, is of value to us only if it is made to live and to interpret the world of to-day.

263. caryatides. See Pl. XVII, Fig. 2.

263. Athena-Nike temple . . . balustrade. See Pl. XXV, Fig. 2.

263. Paionios erected a Nike. See Pl. V, Fig. 3.

264. Alkibiades pressed one of the great painters (viz., Agatharchos of Samos). See Overbeck, *Schriftquellen*, No. 1124.

265. When winds are raging. This poem is by Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, first published in 1855 in the *Plymouth Collection*.

266. Praxiteles. The fullest account of Praxiteles, his life and his work, is contained in Professor Klein's book, *Praxiteles*.

267. "Marble Faun." Made famous by Hawthorne's novel. Hawthorne's description of this statue is given in Robinson, Catalogue, No. 517, page 226. The authorship of Praxiteles cannot be proved. See page 272.

268. Brunn once believed. For bibliography see Robinson, Catalogue, No. 518.

269. the arrow, a reminder of the pastime whence he has fled. The arrow is introduced in a very similar way in a picture by Douglas Volk, which received a prize at the twenty-fifth annual exhibition of the Society of American Artists in New York (1903), and which the art critic of the *New York Sun* said reminded him of these lines:

A boy's will is the wind's will,
And the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts.

A reproduction of this picture may be found in the *Literary Digest*, April 18, 1903, page 575.

273. little . . . Dionysos. For the treatment of the child compare the child in the "Eirene and Ploutos" group, Robinson, Catalogue, No. 515, which is attributed to Kephisodotos, perhaps the father of Praxiteles.

274. Roman art critics. For their verdict see Overbeck, *Schriftquellen*, under "Praxiteles."

275. **The attempt . . . to restore the Hermes.** The restoration is published among the plates of the official publications of the German excavations in Olympia. Photographs of it are obtainable at the Albertinum in Dresden.

276. **mistaken sense of propriety.** The same criticism applies to the fig leaves attached to numberless statues and casts. They spoil the purity of lines and masses, and call attention to the parts which they are meant to hide instead of diverting it. Dr. Johnson, the story goes, once visited an exhibition in company with a young man, who asked the doctor before a certain picture whether he did not think the picture was indecent. "No," retorted Dr. Johnson angrily; "the picture is not indecent, but your question is."

277. **doubtful evidence.** I hold the attribution of this relief to Skopas to be erroneous.

279. **The first accurate glimpse.** See Graef's article on Skopas in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts (Römische)*, 1889, pages 189 ff.

279. **two heads . . . in Tegea.** See Robinson, Catalogue, Nos. 522 A and 522 B.

280. **Meleager . . . in the Fogg Museum of Harvard University.** The Meleager was published by Professor Richard Norton (*Harvard Graduate Magazine*, June, 1900), who deserves the credit of having been the first to appreciate its beauty. In regard to its pose, which he compares to that of the Hermes of Praxiteles, he is clearly mistaken. See pages 281 and 282.

283. **A splendid head of Niobe.** Frontispiece to Zimmermann's *Kunstgeschichte*, Vol. I.

283. **one of her (Niobe's) daughters in the Vatican.** The so-called Niobid Chiaramonti, Pl. XIX, Fig. 3.

283. **On later sarcophagi.** See Baumeister, page 1030, Fig. 1245, and Robinson, Catalogue, No. 726.

284. **a sister flees for refuge to her brother.** In the group reproduced, Pl. XL, Fig. 1, the sister is broken away. She is preserved on a fragment in the Vatican (Baumeister, *Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums*, Pl. LXIV, Fig. 1752). Her arm rested on her brother's knee and there held up his drapery.

284. **the storm of passion runs so high.** Compare the story told in antiquity (Overbeck, *Schriftquellen*, Nos. 1734 ff.) of a picture by Timanthes, representing the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. In this picture the grief and horror of the spectators at the sacrifice were so powerfully expressed that the artist had no means left of portraying the agony of the father of Iphigeneia, and painted him with his head covered, preferring to leave the height of human sorrow to the imagination rather than fail to do it justice while attempting to paint it.

287. **on the tomb.** The fact that it was made up of sixty-five pieces successfully disposes of the argument of Mr. Gardner (*Handbook*, page 386, note 2) that the statue could not have stood on the top of the monument because it was so well preserved. For the picture of a restoration of the monument see Catalogue of Sculpture in British Museum, Vol. II, Pl. XIV. For other portrait statues see Brunn-Arndt, Pls. 427-429 and 477.

287. **Artemisia . . . restored.** See Robinson, Catalogue, No. 585.

288. **Alexander sarcophagus.** For everything pertaining to this and similar sarcophagi (for instance, the Lycean sarcophagus, Pl. XXXIII, Fig. 2) see the monumental publication by Hamdy Bey and Reinach, *Une Nécropole Royale à Sidon*.

289. For some additional works see Pl. XXXV, Fig. 2, and page 92; also Brunn-Arndt, Pls. 13, 18, 71, 123, 126, 257, 259, 310, 372-374, 376-381, 384, 385, 387, 389 and especially 74 Eubouleus, 235 Hypnos.

CHAPTER XXII

PAGE 290. **Lysippos must be explained in this light.** No other Greek artist, I feel sure, has been so completely and so persistently misunderstood as Lysippos. The scope of the book does not permit an argumentative discussion of this artist. By turning to any of the other books on Greek sculpture the student will see how widely I differ from my predecessors.

292. **"inner form."** The interpretation of *constantia* as "inner form" I owe, at least in part, to my friend and former colleague, Dr. J. F. Coar. The literary application of this term Dr. Coar has for the first time fully established in his *Studies in German Literature of the Nineteenth Century* (Macmillan, 1903).

294. **Parthenon frieze . . . stepping-stones.** See pictures of west frieze, page 60.

298. **immediate followers.** Among them Eutychides, who made a statue of the Good Fortune of Antioch.

298. For additional works see Brunn-Arndt, Pls. Nos. 64, 67, 75, 280, 282, 283, 354.

CHAPTER XXIII

PAGE 299. **Autumn Days.** The name "autumn days" is, I believe, one of my own coining. I first used it five years ago in my lectures on Greek and Roman Sculpture in *Progress* (reprinted as Part IV in the *University Lectures on Art*, Chicago).

301. **Aphrodite of Melos.** This discussion of the Aphrodite of Melos is based upon discoveries presented for the first time in an address to the Worcester Art Society, Worcester, Mass., in the spring of 1903.

304. **A view . . . from this side.** It happens that this is the view generally had of the statue, which receives in the Louvre strong light from its right side only.

307. **well liked by the peasant or tourist.** When I last enjoyed a view of the original I was startled by a peasant woman who, coming suddenly upon the statue, exclaimed to her husband, "O August! Sieh 'mal das schöne Ding da ohne 'n Kopf." ("O August! See that beautiful thing there, without a head!")

308. **Belvedere Apollo.** Collignon, in his *Histoire de la Sculpture Grècque*, assigns this statue to the fourth century and to a contemporary of Praxiteles. My reasons for not accepting this attribution are found on pages 300 f., and are based upon my characterization of this entire period.

308. **The dignity of the earlier figures.** Compare the Belvedere Apollo with the Apollo from Olympia, page 18, or even with the "Apollo" of Tenea, page 80.

311. **three are mentioned.** Pliny (*N.H.* 36. 37) mentions Hagesandros, Polydoros, and Athenodoros.

313. **Otricoli Zeus.** If this correspondence of the Laokoön head with the Otricoli Zeus is accepted, it may do away with the mistaken attempt of placing the Otricoli Zeus in the fourth century, unless one believes that the Rhodian sculptors adapted the type of an earlier century, which is, of course, possible. See pages 299, 302, and 303.

314. **Revelation.** Chapter II, 12 and 13.

315. **Zeus.** For technical reasons, only the central figure of this slab, Zeus himself, could be reproduced on Pl. XXXVIII, Fig. 3. To receive an adequate impression of the power which Zeus is compelled to exert, one must also see his opponents. A picture of the entire slab is given in Gardner, *Hand-book*, page 463. Excellent photographs are for sale at the museum in Berlin.

316. **keeps up his fight even against death.** Lord Byron's famous line on the Dying Gaul,


Consents to death but conquers agony,

ill fits the sentiment of the statue, and cannot have been written with the Dying Gaul clearly in mind. People used to misinterpret the Gaul; and the poet, a lover of Greece and of Greek ways, did the same when giving voice to a truly Greek thought he selected this poor instance by which to illustrate it. His words more accurately apply to the Dying Warrior from Aigina, Pl. XIII, Fig. 1, a true Greek, while the Gaul shows, and was intended to show, how a Greek should *not* die.

317. "Farnese Bull." Brunn-Arndt, Pl. 367.

318. Reliefs. For the reliefs of this period see Schreiber, *Hellenistische Reliefbilder*, and Hauser, *Die neu-attischen Reliefs*.

318. For some additional works see Head from Pergamon, Pl. XXXIX, Fig. 4; Themis of Rhamnos, Pl. XXXX, Fig. 2; and Robinson, Catalogue, Nos. 502, 531, 577, 655, 657, 667-669, 758; also Brunn-Arndt, Pls. 9, 48, 53, 124, 137, 139, 155, 168, 196, 240, 264, 322, 342, 347 *a*, 360, 367, 392-394, 424, 425, 433, 440, 478, 479, 480.



SELECTED AND GRADED BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE. — The numbers prefixed to the titles of the books designate the groups to which the books belong. Group 1 consists of those books which the interested reader will find most valuable. The serious student will need those of Group 2, and the specialist those of Group 3.

Complete bibliographies of most of the statues and reliefs discussed in this book are contained in the catalogues by Edward Robinson and Friederichs-Wolters, mentioned below.

GENERAL BOOKS

- (1) JOHN RUSKIN. *Aratra Pentelici, Six Lectures on Sculpture*. Very inspiring but, like all of the writings of Mr. Ruskin, to be used with care.
- (2) BALDWIN BROWN. *The Fine Arts*.
- (3) SIR CHARLES EASTLAKE. *Contributions to the Fine Arts*. Expensive but invaluable.

INTRODUCTORY BOOKS

- (1) F. B. TARBELL. *A History of Greek Art*. Short and concise.
- (2) ERNEST GARDNER. *Handbook of Greek Sculpture*. Excellent archaeological presentation of the subject.
- (1) E. VON MACH. *Sculpture, Greek and Roman*. Published in *Progress* (January, 1901) by International Art Association, Chicago; republished among the *University Lectures on Art*. An attempt at a short, popular presentation of the subject.
- (2) KEKULÉ VON STRADONITZ. The chapter on "Greek Art" in *Bädeker's Greece*. Not illustrated but very interesting.

COMPLETE AND FULLY ILLUSTRATED HISTORIES OF GREEK ART

- (2) MAXIME COLLIGNON. Written in French, also German translation.
- (2) JOHANNES OVERBECK. Written in German, the most reliable.
- (3) MRS. LUCY MITCHELL. An American author. Good but somewhat antiquated.

- (3) MURRAY. English. Most interesting, presenting many individual theories of the author.
- (2) MAX GEORG ZIMMERMANN. *Kunstgeschichte des Altertums und des Mittelalters*.
- (2) ADOLF MICHAELIS. Vol. I of the revised edition of Anton Springer's *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*.
- (3) PERRY. *Greek and Roman Sculpture*.

SPECIAL REFERENCES TO ART BEFORE 650 B.C.

- (1) F. B. TARBELL. *Greek Art*. Introductory chapters.
- (2) TSOUNTAS and MANATT. *Mycenæan Age*.
- (3) MASPERO. *Egyptian Archæology*. English translation.
- (3) BABELON. *Assyrian Archæology*. English translation.
- (3) H. R. HALL. *Oldest Civilization in Greece*. Technical.

FOR THE STUDY OF ANCIENT LITERARY REFERENCES

- (3) JOHANNES OVERBECK. *Schriftquellen*. A collection of all Greek and Latin references to art known in 1865.
- (2) H. STUART JONES. Selections of the above, with translations into English. (NOTE.—Some of the translations in my book are borrowed from or based on this book of Mr. Jones.)
- (3) K. JEX-BLAKE and F. SELLERS. *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. Text, translation, introduction, and commentary.
- (3) S. H. BUTCHER. *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Arts*. Text, translation, introduction, and commentary.
- (3) FRAZER. *Pausanias*. Translation and complete commentary. (Price, \$25.)

READY REFERENCE BOOKS

- (1) E. ROBINSON. *Catalogue of Casts*, Boston. The standard book in English.
- (2) FRIEDERICH-WOLTERS. *Catalogue of Casts*, Berlin. The standard book in German.
- (2) BAUMEISTER. *Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums*. An encyclopedia of ancient monuments.
- (3) All the catalogues of important museums.


ADDITIONAL BOOKS

- (3) HEINRICH BRUNN. *Geschichte der griechischen Künstler*. Vol. I, *Bildhauer*.
- (3) ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER. *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*. To be used with care, because offering some as yet untested views; invaluable to the specialist. It is a most interesting book, written by one of the most inspiring and indefatigable archæologists.
- (3) ADOLF MICHAELIS. *Der Parthenon*. Published in 1870. It is the book on the Parthenon.
- (3) ERNEST GARDNER. *Ancient Athens*. The latest summary of archæological investigations concerning Athens.
- (3) CHARLES WALDSTEIN. *Essays on the Art of Pheidias*.
- (3) CLARAC. *Musée de Sculpture*. The small reprint known as the *Clarac de poche*. An invaluable companion, containing in outline almost every well-known antique statue.

PERIODICALS

- American: *American Journal of Archæology*.
Records of the Past, Washington, D.C.
- English: *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.
- German: *Jahrbuch des k. deutschen archäologischen Instituts*.
- French: *Gazette des Beaux Arts*
Gazette Archéologique.
Révue Archéologique.
- Greek: Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική.

Special references to other books are given in the Notes.



INDEX

- Adams, Miss Maude, gold statue of, 325.
- Agatharchos, painter, 337.
- Age differentiation, 177.
- Ageladas of Argos, 207, 336.
- Aigina, temple of, 25, 181, 182 ff., 328; color on sculptures from, 70; restored elevation of, Pl. XII, Fig. 1; pediments of, Pl. XV, Fig. 1.
- Aiginetan bronze, 94.
- Aiolians, 80.
- Aischylos, 128, 196, 315.
- Akrolithic statues, 94.
- Akropolis, 98.
- Akropolis figures, Athens, 120, 144 ff., 174, 328; painted, 70; facing page 144; Pl. VIII, Figs. 1-3; Pl. IX, Figs. 3 and 4.
- Akropolis head from south slope of Akropolis, 282; Pl. XXXIX, Fig. 3.
- Akropolis, sculpture found on, 104.
- Alexander the Great, 2; portraits of, 293 f.
- Alexander Sarcophagus, 288; Pl. XXXIII, Fig. 1; Pl. XXXIV, Figs. 1-3.
- Alexandria, 317.
- Alkamenes, 42, 322, 331.
- Alkibiades, 264.
- Altar of Pergamon, 313 ff., facing pages 314, 322; Pl. XXXVII, Fig. 2; Pl. XXXVIII, Fig. 3.
- Alxenor of Naxos, 104, 149; stele by, Pl. III, Fig. 2.
- Amazon, dead, in Naples, 316 f.; Pl. XXXVIII, Fig. 4.
- Amazon frieze, Maussoleion, 286 f., facing page 46; Pl. XXXII, Figs. 1 and 2.
- Amazons, Parthenon metopes, 213.
- Amazons, statues of, 255 ff.; Pl. XXIV, Figs. 1-3; draperies of, 257 f.
- Ambracia, sculptors in, 104.
- America, 2.
- American sculpture, 14.
- Anatomy of Apollo statues, 114.
- Anima* (breath of life), 166, 186.
- Animus* (soul), 166.
- Antenor, 47, 161, 328.
- Aphaia, deity worshiped in Aigina, 182.
- Aphrodite of Arles, 302; Pl. XXXV, Fig. 2.
- Aphrodite of Capua, 305; Pl. XXXV, Fig. 3.
- Aphrodite of Melos, 47, 301 ff., facing page 300; Pl. XXXV, Fig. 1; correct restoration of, 303 f.; drapery of, compared with Parthenon, 302.
- Aphrodite of Praxiteles in Knidos, 276 f.; Pl. XXVIII, Fig. 2; Pl. XIX, Fig. 2.
- Apobates, north frieze, Parthenon, Pl. XVI, Fig. 3.

- Apollo, of the Belvedere, 308 ff., 340;
 Pl. XXIII, Fig. 4; Pl. XXXVI,
 Fig. 1; dated by Collignon, 316.
 Apollo of Olympia, 193 ff., facing
 page 18.
 Apollo, relief of, from Thasos, 134,
 138 f.; Pl. VII, Fig. 1.
 "Apollo" statues, 109 ff.; age of,
 164; anatomy of, 114; character
 of, 164; hands of, 111 ff.; pose of,
 115 f.; points of resemblance of,
 with Akropolis figures, 146.
 "Apollo" with the Omphalos, 172 ff.;
 Pl. XI, Fig. 1.
 "Apollo," Choiseul-Gouffier, 173 ff.;
 Pl. XI, Fig. 3.
 "Apollo" of Orchomenos, 113;
 Pl. IV, Fig. 4.
 "Apollo" Sauroktonos, 269 ff.; Pl.
 XXVI, Fig. 2.
 "Apollo," Strangford, 110; Pl. IV,
 Fig. 3.
 "Apollo" of Tenea, 110, 140, facing
 page 80; compared with Doryphoros,
 250; with Apoxyomenos, 296.
 "Apollo" of Thera, 110; Pl. IV,
 Fig. 3.
 Apoxyomenos of Lysippos, 296 f.,
 facing page 296; Pl. XIX, Fig. 3;
 compared with Doryphoros, 296.
 Appeal of Greek sculpture, 17 ff.
 Arcadia, sculptors in, 104.
 Archæological treatment of ancient
 art, 6.
 Archæologists, 101.
 "Archaic smile," misnomer, 154 f.,
 186, 328.
 Archermos of Chios, 118, 120.
 Argive bronze, 94.
 Argos, fragments from, 252, 259 ff.;
 Pl. XV, Fig. 4; Pl. XXIII, Fig. 3.
 Argos, temple of Hera at, 145.
 Aristion, stele of, 71; Pl. III, Fig. 3.
 Aristogeiton, 160 f.; compared with
 Aigina sculptures, 186; with Dis-
 cus Thrower, 169, facing page
 158.
 Aristophanes, 3, 332.
 Aristotle, 30.
 Armbruster, 321.
 Art centers, close intercourse be-
 tween, 151.
 Art conditions before seventh cen-
 tury B.C., 79 ff.
 Artemis, Daidaleian, 103; of Delos,
 117 ff.; of Gabii, facing page 92;
 of Versailles, 308 ff.; Pl. XXXVI,
 Fig. 2.
 Artemisia, 285.
 Aryan race, 80.
 Assos, frieze from, 66, 133; Pl. II,
 Fig. 2.
 Assyria, 13; relation of, to Greece,
 85.
 Assyrian sculpture, colored, 68.
 Athena, of Aigina, 182, 187 f.; in-
 ventress of flutes, 170; Lemnia,
 208 ff., 332, facing page 202;
 Pl. XVII, Fig. 1; on Parthenon
 frieze, 132; Parthenos, 94, 204 ff.;
 group, Pergamon, 314, facing page
 322; and Poseidon, struggle of,
 245 ff.
 Athena-Nike temple, 27, 55, 263, 335;
 Pl. II, Fig. 3; Pl. XXV, Fig. 2.
 Athenian sculpture, overgreat deli-
 cacy of, 7, 150 ff.
 Athens, 2; influence of, 262; sculp-
 tors at, 104.
 Athlete, see "Apollo."
 Attalos I, 2, 315.
 Attempts, first, in the round, 103 ff.;
 in relief, 123 ff.

- Autumn days of Greek sculpture, 299 ff., 326, 339; characterized, 300 f.
- Ball, Sir Robert, 3.
- Battle scene, arrangement in Aigina, 183.
- Beethoven, 3.
- Bigelow, Hon. John, 299.
- Birth of Athena, relief of, in Madrid, 232; on Parthenon, 231 ff.
- Body, human, 248.
- Bœotia, sculpture in, 104.
- Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 75, 103; recent acquisition of, 92; vase fragment at, containing copy of Tyrannicide group, 161, 329.
- Boston, statue of Hamilton at, 89.
- Brazilian draughtsmen, 10.
- Broken Fetters: a Period of Transition, 158 ff.
- Bronze, 92 ff.
- Bronze coating on Roman copies, 77.
- Bronzes melted, 97.
- Byron, Lord, 340.
- Byzantium, scholars imported from, 99.
- Calf on "Harpy" tomb, 133.
- Caligula, 95.
- Carrara marble, 91.
- Carrey, drawings by, 238, 242; Pl. XIV, Fig. 2.
- Carved relief, 37.
- Caryatid, 263; Pl. XIV, Fig. 2.
- Centaur and girl, group from Olympia, 195; Pl. X, Fig. 1; metope on Parthenon, 55; Pl. X, Fig. 3.
- Center line in statues, 270 f.
- Chalfin, Paul, 322.
- Character differentiation, 177.
- Character, stillness of, 265; suggestion of, 200.
- Charioteer of Delphi, 175 ff.; Pl. XI, Fig. 2; from frieze of Maussoleion, Pl. XXV, Fig. 1.
- Cheramytes, dedicator of statue to Hera, 105.
- Chios, school of, 118.
- Christians, early, vulgar zeal of, 96.
- Chryselephantine statues, 94.
- Church, Protestant, 31; Roman Catholic, 31; its conservatism, 67.
- Cicero, verdict of, concerning Kalamis, 175.
- Circles, Greek, mathematically inaccurate, 61 ff.
- Circumlitio*, 69.
- Classical training, 262, 337.
- Coar, Dr. J. F., viii, 339.
- Cock, on "Harpy" tomb, 132; on Spartan tombstone, 127, 132.
- Cole, W. W. G., collection of photographs by, 321.
- Collignon, Maxime, 316.
- Colored statues of saints, 67.
- Coloring of Greek sculpture, 67 ff.
- Coloring of statues, practical experiments in, 73.
- Commemorative statues, comments on, 19.
- Conservatism, 144 ff.
- Constantia* of Lysippos, 292.
- Contrasted action, 46.
- Conventions of sculpture, 51.
- Cooley, Dr. Arthur S., 325, 326; collection of photographs by, 321.
- Cow, of Myron, 67; on Parthenon frieze, 54.
- Crete, 32, 81; sculptors in, 104.
- Curtius, Ernst, 324.

- Daidalos, 103; pupils of, 103 f.
 Darwin, 3.
 Dawn announcing Helios, on Parthenon, 235.
 Dead, representation of, in sculpture, 215.
 Death, brother of sleep, 131.
 Deidameia, 198.
 Delian bronze, 94.
 Delian, Diadoumenos of, 254, 326; Pl. XXII, Fig. 3.
 Delphi, 95; attacked by Gauls, 315; exchange of artistic ideas at, 151.
 Demeter of Knidos, 282 f., frontispiece.
 "Demeter," Parthenon, 237.
 Demetrios Poliorketes, 306.
 Destructive forces, 91 ff.
 Details, telling use of, 172.
 Diadoumenos of Polykleitos, 253 ff.; Pl. XXII, Figs. 2 and 3.
Diane à la biche, La, 309 f.
 Dimensions, of painting, 22; of sculpture, 22.
 Discus Thrower of Myron, facing page 168.
 Distant planes on reliefs, 50.
 Dorian, invasion, 82; race, characterized, 105; school of sculpture indistinguishable from the Ionian, 104 f.
 Dorians, 2, 80.
 Doric frieze, 42.
 Doryphoros of Polykleitos, 249 ff.; Pl. XXII, Fig. 1; Pl. XXIII, Fig. 1; bronze head from Herculaneum, 255; Pl. XXXIII, Fig. 2; compared with Apoxyomenos, 296; in Argos, 336.
 Draperies of statues, 25.
 Drapery, of Akropolis figures, 152; on column from Ephesos, 277; Pl. XXXI, Fig. 2; on "Harpy" tomb, 133; influence of, upon treatment of the nude, 149 ff.
 Dying Gladiator, wrong name for Dying Gaul, 315 f.
 Dying Warrior, Aigina, Pl. XIII, Figs. 1 and 2.
 Eastlake, Sir Charles, 46.
 Egypt, 13; history of, 86; intercourse of, with Greece, 59; relations of, to Greece, 86 ff.
 Egyptian, art conceptions, 87; dynasties, 87; reliefs, 40; sculpture, colored, 68; standing figures, 87 f.; Pl. III, Fig. 1; wall paintings, 11.
Elegantia of Lysippos, 292.
 Elgin, Lord, xvii.
 Elimination, 9, 26.
 Ephesos, sculptors at, 104; column from, 277; Pl. XXXI, Fig. 2.
 Epidauros, 92, 334.
 Erechtheion, 263.
 Eros, 117.
 Eumenes II, 314.
 Euphranor, 295.
 Eutychides, 339.
 Eve, creation of, 233.
 Exchange of artistic ideals, 104.
 Eye, treatment of, 148.
 Eyes, Praxitelean, 273, 309; Skopasian, 280.
 Face, treatment of, 149.
 Faces, of Akropolis figures, 153; from Olympia, absence of expression on, 200.
 Faith, strength of, 158.
 Fallen warrior of Aigina, 184 f.
 Farnese athletes, 329.
 "Farnese Bull," colossal group, 317.
 Farnese Diadoumenos, 333.

- "Fates, Three," Parthenon, 237, 239 f., facing page 232.
 Figure from bottom of the sea, facing page 100; discussed, 325 f.
 Fitness of things, knowledge of, 49.
 Flesh parts, color of, 72.
 Flying figure from Delos, 117 ff., 327; Pl. V, Fig. 2; compared with Apollo of Thasos, 139; dated, 121 f.
 Forbes, Miss, 280.
 Furniture, on Spartan tombstones, 126; on "Harpy" tomb and on Parthenon, 229.
 Furtwängler, Adolf, 208 ff., 332.
Ganosis, 72.
 Gardner, Ernest, 89, 206, 322, 332, 339.
 Gaul, Dying, 315 f.
 Gauls, fierce race, 315 f.
 Gestures in sculpture, 141.
 Ghiberti gates, 38.
 Gods, Greek conception of, 203.
 Gods and giants, Parthenon metopes, 213; Pergamon altar, 313 ff.
 Goldsmith's art, 81.
 Goths, 96.
 Grace of workmanship, 174.
 Graces, relief from Thasos, 137.
 Greek, names of gods, 99; sculpture, chief characteristics of, 318.
 Greenough, statue of Washington by, 26.
 Grouping of figures, 124; on Spartan tombstones, 126; on reliefs from Thasos, 135 ff.
 Gyölbashi, tomb from, 335.
 Hair, treatment of, in early sculpture, 173.
 Hamdy Bey, 339.
 Hamilton, statue of, by Rimmer, Boston, 89.
 Hands, treatment of, in early sculpture, 111 ff.
 Harmodios, 47, 160; resemblance of, to Parthenon metope figure, 218.
 Harpies, 130.
 "Harpy" monument (or tomb), 127, 129 ff., 187; Pl. VI, Figs. 1-4.
 Harvard, Meleager at, 280; Pl. XXX, Fig. 1.
 Head, treatment of, in Egypt, 88; in Greece, 88.
 Helios, Parthenon, 235; Pl. XVIII, Fig. 2.
 Hera, head, from Olympia, 154; Pl. IX, Fig. 1; from Argos, 260, facing pages 2 and 8; Pl. XVI, Fig. 2.
 Hera, Parthenon frieze, 51.
 "Hera" of Samos, 105 ff., 114, 134, facing page 106.
 Heraion in Olympia, 178.
 Herakles, 179.
 Herculaneum, xvii, 255; bronzes from, 93.
 Hermes, Logios, 140, 326; by Praxiteles, 97, 237, 271 ff., facing page 262; Pl. XXVIII, Fig. 1; Pl. XIX, Fig. 1; colored cast of, 74; relief of, from Thasos, 137 ff.; drapery of, 147; and a "Grace," facing page 134.
 Herodotos, 68.
 Hestia, the Giustiniani, 331; Pl. XL, Fig. 4.
 High relief, 46 ff.; requirements of, 48.
 Hippias, 161.
 Hippodameia, 189 ff.
 Hippokampoi, 336.
 Hirst, G. C., viii, 328.

- Hölderlin, 4.
 Homeric poems, 2, 83, 203.
 Homolle, 175, 330.
Horror vacui, 50, 65.
 Horse of Selene, goddess of the moon, 240.
 Horsemen, west frieze, Parthenon, facing page 38.
 Hydra, 179.
 Hymettos, Mt., marble from, 91.
 Hypnos (sleep), 131, 339.

 Idealism, 8.
 Idolino bronze, 337.
 Ignorance, early, of Greek sculpture, 91 ff.
 Ikteinos, 211.
 "Ilissos," on Parthenon, 243.
 Illusion, facility of, in low relief, 51.
 Imagination, 18.
 Inanimate nature, 21.
 India, 2.
 Individual, the, in sculpture, 262 ff.
 Inner form, 292.
 "Ino-Leukothea" relief, 130; Pl. I, Fig. 4.
 Iolaos, 179.
 Ionian race, characterized, 105.
 Ionian school, indistinguishable from Dorian, 105.
 Ionians, 80.
 Ionic frieze, 42.
 Iris, on Parthenon pediment, 238; Pl. XIX, Fig. 3; on Parthenon frieze, 5; Pl. I, Fig. 2.
 Island gems, 84.
 Island relief, 58 ff.
Isokephalism, 65; on reliefs from Assos, 133; on "Harpy" tomb, 133.

 Joan of Arc, 24.
 Johnson, Dr., 338.

 Kalamis, 160, 174 ff.
 Kallikrates, 211.
 Kanon of Polykleitos, 250 ff.
 Kaufmann head of Aphrodite, 278; Pl. XXXIX, Fig. 1; Pl. XL, Fig. 3.
 Keats, 4.
 Keftiu, 11.
 Kekulé, Freiherr von Stradonitz, 233.
 Kephisodotos, sculptor, 337.
 "Kephissos," on Parthenon, 243; Pl. XIII, Fig. 4.
 "Kladeos," reclining youth, Olympia, 192; Pl. XIII, Fig. 3.
 Klein on Praxiteles, 266, 337.
 Knidian Aphrodite, 276 ff.; Kaufmann head, 278.
 Knidian "Demeter," 282 f.
 Kreon, 264.
 Kritios, 48, 161.

 Laborde, Comte, head, 242.
 Ladas of Myron, 167 ff.
 Lancelotti palace, 168.
 "Laokoön," by Lessing, 311.
 Laokoön group, 311 ff.; Pl. XXXVII, Fig. 1.
 Laokoön head and Zeus Otricoli compared, 313; Pl. XXXVIII.
 Lapith, dying, metope, Parthenon, 215; victorious, metope, Parthenon, 214; folds of, 236.
 Lapiths, Olympia, 189, 193 ff.; Parthenon, 213 ff.
 Lebrun, Mme., 327.
 Lemnian Athena, 208 ff., 332, facing page 202; Pl. XVII, Fig. 1.
 Lemnos, sculptors at, 104.
 Lepsius, R., 325.
 Lessing, 311.
 Light and shadow, importance of, 41.

- Limitations of space, forgotten in Parthenon pediments, 241; and material, mastery over, 216.
- Lines *vs.* spots, 64.
- Link with the past (Tyrannicides), 160.
- Literary Digest*, 323, 337.
- Literary evidence for coloring of statues, 69.
- Literature, Greek and Roman, 69.
- Loewy, Professor Emanuel, 10, 12, 321, 327.
- Long, Percy W., viii.
- Low relief, 48 ff.
- Lycean sarcophagus, Pl. XXXIII, Fig. 2.
- Lyseas, stele of, painted, 71; Pl. III, Fig. 4.
- Lysippos, 290 ff.; pose of statues by, 294, 303; proportions of statues of, 295 f.
- Lythgoe, A. M., excavator, 325.
- Macedonia, 2.
- Madrid, 95, 232.
- Malea, Cape, 98.
- Mansfield, Richard, production of *Henry V* by, 326.
- Mantineia, base from, 27; Pl. I, Fig. 1.
- "Marble Faun" (Satyr), 267 ff.; tail of, 268; Pl. XXVI, Fig. 1.
- Marsyas of Myron, 169; Pl. X, Fig. 2; compared with Olympian centaurs, 199 f.
- Mater Dolorosa of antiquity (Knidian Demeter), 282 f.
- Material of Greek sculpture, 91 ff.
- Mausoleum (Maussoleion), 65.
- Maussolos, statue of, 287, facing page 286; tomb of, 285 ff.
- Medicis, tomb of, 29.
- Meleager, pose of, 281; statues of, 279 ff.; Pl. XXX, Figs. 1 and 2; compared with Hermes of Praxiteles, 281.
- Memory picture, 8 ff.
- Memory, uncertain, 9.
- Mental image, 8 ff.
- Metopes, 41; defined, 212; Olympian, 212; Parthenon, 211 ff.
- Michelangelo, 29, 233, 298, 329.
- Middle ages of Greece, 32, 79.
- Mikkiades of Chios, 118.
- Modeled relief, 37.
- Moderation, 177; characteristic of Myron, 170.
- Morosini, 98.
- Mother Earth, Pergamon altar, 315.
- Motion in sculpture, 116 f.
- Motto of Greek sculptors, 36.
- Mouth, Praxitelean, 274 f.; Skopasian, 280; treatment of, in early art, 154 ff.
- Mycenæ, excavations at, 86; gate at (lionesses), 106; Pl. IV, Fig. 1.
- Mycenæan age, 32, 80, 81; civilization of, 2.
- Myron, 160, 166 ff.; pupil of Ageladas, 207.
- Naukratis, 86, 104.
- Naxian marble, 91.
- "Nereids," figures of, from Lycean tomb, 130, 336.
- Nesiotes, 48, 161.
- Nike, 117; of Brescia, 305; Pl. XXXV, Fig. 4; by Paionios, 26, 120, 263; Pl. V, Fig. 3; of Samothrace, 306 f., facing p. 30; Pl. XXXI, Fig. 3; on arch of Trajan, 305.
- "Nike," of Delos, 117 ff.; on Parthenon pediment, 238 f.; Pl. XIX, Fig. 2.

- Nikias, 69.
 Niobe group, 283 ff., 338; Pl. XXXI, Fig. 1.
 Niobe, son of, 238; Pl. XL, Fig. 1.
 Niobid Chiaramonti (Vatican), 283 f., 310; Pl. XIX, Fig. 1.
 Niobid sarcophagi, 283 f.
 Noblest ideas, realization of, 202 ff.
 Norton, Charles Eliot, 322.
 Norton, Richard, 282, 338.
 Nymphs, relief from Thasos, 135.
- Objective nature, 5.
 Oinomaos, 189 ff.
 Olympia, 120; exchange of artistic ideas in, 151; Hermes found in, 271.
 Olympia temple of Zeus, 188 ff.; plan of pediments of, Pl. XIV, Fig. 1; east pediment of, 189 ff., Pl. XIV, Fig. 4; Pl. XV, Fig. 2; west pediment of, 193 ff.; sculptures of, compared with Aigina, 191; sculptures of, compared with Parthenon, 224; wrong arrangement of figures on, 195 ff.
 Open action, 46.
 Oxyrrhynchos papyrus, 336.
- Painting, traces of, on pieces of sculpture, 145.
 Paionios, 26, 120, 331.
 Panathenaic festival, 219.
 Panther skin on Parthenon metope, 215, 236.
 Parian marble, 91.
 Parthenon, 4; view of, Pl. XII, Fig. 2; destroyed, 98, 213.
 Parthenon frieze, 26 f., 38, 48 f., 132; arrangement of, 219; Pl. XVI, Fig. 4; depth of, 40; discussed, 218 ff.; facility of looking along, 63; few accessories represented on, 71; *isokephalism* of, 65; east side of, 227 ff., facing pages 60 and 212; Pl. I, Fig. 2; Pl. XV, Fig. 3; north side of, 225 ff.; Pl. XX, Figs. 1-4; south side of, 227; Pl. II, Fig. 1; west side of, 222 ff., facing pages 60 and 218.
 Parthenon metopes, 55, 213 ff.; Pl. XXI, Figs. 1 and 2.
 Parthenon, pediments of, 231 ff.; east pediment of, 231 ff., 322; Pl. XII, Figs. 3 and 4; Pl. XVIII, Figs. 1-3; Pl. XIX, Figs. 2 and 3; west pediment of, 242 ff.
 Parthenon, sculptors, 51 f., 64, 141, 323; sculptures, 42.
 Pastoral tendencies in sculpture, 318.
 Patina, 93.
 Pausanias, 100, 192, 231, 331.
 Pedimental compositions, restrictions of, 180 ff.
 Peirithoös, 189, 193 ff., facing page 188; Pl. XVI, Fig. 1.
 Peisistratos, 2, 121, 146, 328.
 Pellene, statues by Pheidias in, 331.
 Peloponnesian war, 262.
 Pelops, chariot race with Oinomaos, 189 ff.
 Pergamon, 2, 97, 180; head from, 34; Pl. XXXIX, Fig. 4; Museum in Berlin, 314; school of sculpture of, 313 ff.
 Peri, statue of, by Westmacott, 305.
 Perikles, 94, 207 f., 211, 264, facing page 2.
 Periods of Greek sculpture, 6.
 "Persephone," Parthenon, 237, 282.
 Persian wars, 2, 121.
 Perspective, 39 f.; aerial, 39; linear, 39; early knowledge of, 127.

- Pheidias, 4, 26, 34, 42, 160, 203 ff., 248, 322; slanderous stories concerning, 208, 331.
 Phigaleia, temple of, 335.
 Philochoros, 332.
 Philosophers, Greek, 32.
 Philosophic schools, 202.
 Phœnicia, relation of, to Greece, 85.
 Physical effort and pleasure at extended compositions, 60 ff.
 Physical energy, waste of, 64.
 Pictorial element in Greek sculpture, 131 f.
 Pig on "Harpy" tomb, 132.
 Plato, 69, 203.
 Pliny, 69, 77, 100, 171, 205, 299.
 Plutarch, 4, 332.
 Polygnotos, 323.
 Polykleitean neglect of nobler side, 6.
 Polykleitos, 115, 248; ancient estimate of, 252; Kanon (rule of proportions) of, 295; pupil of Ageladas, 207; teaching of, 260.
 Polyzalos of Syracuse, 176.
 Pompeii, xvii; bronzes, 93.
 "Poros," 91, 178.
 Pose, of "Apollo" statues, 115 f.; expressive of character, 132 f.
 Poseidon, 245 ff.; of Lysippos, 294.
 Praxiteles, 4, 7, 69, 266 ff., 288 f., 306.
 Priestesses, of Athena, 145; of Hera, 145.
 Principles, formulated, 290 ff.
 Problems of relief sculpture solved in Parthenon, 229.
 Profile, Greek, 336.
 Public, relation of, to artist, 29 ff.; responsible for art standards, 35.
 Purity of form, 69.
 Pythagoras of Rhegion, 160, 172.
 Quincy, Quatremère de, 76.
 Rainsford, Dr. W. S., 321.
 Raphael, 233.
 Realism, 8.
 Reflex action, 165, 177.
 Reinach, Professor Solomon, 329, 339.
 Reissner, Dr., excavator, 325.
 Relief from Thasos, 134 ff.; technique of, 141 ff.; Pl. VII, Figs. 1-3.
 Relief sculpture, first attempts at, 123 ff.; in proper light, 41; principles of, 37 ff.; relation of, to architecture, 53 ff.
 Renaissance, 14.
 Renaissance artists, 67, 68.
 Restoration of statues, 162 f., 328.
 Restrictions, of shape of block, 147; willingness to submit to, 241.
 Rhodes, 317; sculptors of, 104.
 Rimmer, American sculptor, 89.
 Robinson, Edward, 69, 70, 73 ff., 188, 304, 323, 324, 327.
 Roman names of gods, 99.
 Roman writers, 34.
 Rome, 2.
 Rounded surfaces, reliefs on, 57 ff.
 Ruskin, 21, 23, 24, 31, 82, 248, 313, 321.
 Salamis, battle of, 145, 159.
 Satan, seat of, 314.
 Satyr ("Marble Faun"), 267 ff.; Pl. XXVI, Fig. 1; Pl. XXVII, Figs. 2 and 3.
 "Sauroktonos," 269 ff.; Pl. XXVI, Fig. 2; Pl. XXVII, Figs. 1 and 4.
 Scaliger, 30.
 Schliemann, Dr., 80.
 Sculptors, Greek and Roman, compared, 254.

- Selene, Parthenon, 240; Pl. XVIII, Fig. 3.
- Shadows, insufficient, 125; removed, 43 f.; suppression of, 50; treatment of, in reliefs, 39.
- Shelley, 4.
- Simplicity of Greek art, 4.
- Sincerity, lack of, in some Akropolis figures, 156 f.
- Sirens, 130.
- Sistine Madonna, 207.
- Skopas, 7, 279 ff., 288 f., 326.
- Smith, J. Linden, 73.
- Sophokles, 25, facing page 8.
- Soul, its spiritual meaning unknown, 150, 202.
- Sources of knowledge of Greek sculpture, 91 ff.
- Space, restrictions of, 106.
- Spartan tombstones, 124 ff.; Pl. I, Fig. 3.
- Spirit of Greek sculpture, xviii, 1.
- Spots *vs.* lines, 64.
- St. Paul, Epistle to the Galatians (Gauls), 316.
- Standing warrior (Spearman) of Aigina, 185 ff., facing page 178.
- Stepping-stones on Parthenon frieze, 27, 53.
- Sterope from Olympia, 191.
- Stiacciato relief, 40.
- Stowe, Mrs. H. B., 337.
- Strassburg, statue of, in Paris, 204.
- Subjective nature, 5.
- Suggested lines, 47; principle of, 134 f., 136.
- Suggestion, principle of, 128, 177, 244.
- Sulla, 95.
- Tegea pediments, 280.
- Temple decorations, 178 ff.
- Temple sculpture, oldest, on Akropolis, 178.
- Terra cottas, 40.
- Thasos reliefs, 132.
- Themis of Rhamnos, 341; Pl. XL, Fig. 2.
- Theseion, 323, 335; slabs from frieze of, facing page 54.
- Theseus from Olympia, 193 f.
- "Theseus" from the Parthenon, 236; Pl. VIII, Fig. 1.
- Thorwaldsen, 181.
- Thought, reality of, 4.
- Thoughts, world of, to-day, 30.
- Timanthes, painter, 338.
- Timotheus, 92.
- Tin garment on Aphrodite in Vatican, 276.
- Tombstones, Spartan, 124 ff.
- Torso in Copenhagen resembling Artemis of Versailles, 310.
- Tradition, uncertain, 290.
- Tragedies, Greek, 32.
- Tralles, school of sculpture at, 317.
- Transition, period of, 158 ff.
- Treu, Professor, curator of the Albertinum, Dresden, 275, 323, 329, 330.
- Triglyphs defined, 212.
- Trojan war, Parthenon metopes, 213.
- "Tufa," 91, 179.
- Typhon, 178; Pl. XIV, Fig. 3.
- Tyrannicides, 163 ff., 328; Pl. V, Fig. 2.
- Vaison Diadoumenos, 253; Pl. XXII, Fig. 2.
- Variety in grouping, 135 ff.
- Vase painters of draped figures, 47, 322.
- Vases, study of, overdone, 324.

- Venus, of Capua, 305; Pl. XXXV, Fig. 3; de Milo (wrong name for Aphrodite of Melos), 301 ff.
- Venus Genetrix, 73, facing page 68.
- Vision, 18; erratic, 61; restless, 38; uncertain, 49, 51.
- Volk, Douglas, artist, 337.
- Waldstein, Charles, 172, 249, 326, 335.
- Waltz, Christian, 323.
- Warrior, bearded, bronze head of, from Athens, 154; Pl. IX, Fig. 2.
- Washington, George, statue of, by Greenough, 26.
- Washington, H. S., 325.
- Watt, 3.
- Wax figures, 19.
- Weber head, 242; Pl. XXXIX, Fig. 2.
- Wellesley College, investigation of students in seminary course at, 323.
- Westmacott, English sculptor, 305.
- Winckelmann, xvii, 100, 108.
- Wolters, Professor Paul, 327.
- Worcester Art Society, lecture before the, 340.
- Xanthos, 129.
- Xerxes, 160 f.
- Youth reclining (Kladeos), Olympia, 182 f.
- Zeus, of Olympia, 189; Olympian, by Pheidias, 26, 34, 94, 95, 205 ff.; head of, on coins from Elis, 205; Otricoli bust of, 313; on Parthenon frieze, 132; on Pergamon altar, 315; temple of, in Olympia, 181.



PLATES

NOTE. — The museums where the originals are preserved are mentioned in List of Illustrations.




PLATE I




FIG. 1. APOLLO, MARSYAS, AND SLAVE, FROM MANTINEA




FIG. 2. ZEUS, HERA, AND IRIS (East Frieze, Parthenon)



FIG. 3. SPARTAN TOMBSTONE



FIG. 4. TOMBSTONE

PLATE II



FIG. 1. BOLTING COW (South Frieze, Parthenon)




FIG. 2. RELIEF FROM ASSO



FIG. 3. BATTLE SCENE (Athena-Nike Temple Frieze)

PLATE III




FIG. 1. EGYPTIAN STANDING FIGURE



FIG. 2. GRAVE STELE BY ALXENOR



FIG. 3. GRAVE STELE OF ARISTION



FIG. 4. PAINTED STELE OF LYSEAS

PLATE IV



FIG. 1. GATE OF LIONESSES (Mycenæ)



FIG. 2. STRANGFORD "APOLLO"




FIG. 3. "APOLLO" OF THERA




FIG. 4. APOLLO OF ORCHOMENOS

PLATE V



FIG. 3. NIKE OF PAIONIOS




FIG. 2. TYRANNICIDE GROUP




FIG. 1. FLYING FIGURE FROM DELOS



FIG. 1



FIG. 2



FIG. 3



FIG. 4

FRIEZE OF "HARPY" TOMB

PLATE VII



THE THREE SLABS FORMING THE RELIEF FROM THASOS




FIG. 3




FIG. 2

DRAPED FIGURES (Akropolis, Athens)




FIG. 1

PLATE IX



FIG. 1. HERA OF OLYMPIA



FIG. 2. BRONZE HEAD OF WARRIOR
(Athens)



FIG. 3. FRAGMENT OF DRAPED FIGURE
(Akropolis, Athens)



FIG. 4. FRAGMENT OF DRAPED FIGURE
(Akropolis, Athens)



FIG. 1. CENTAUR AND LAPITH WOMAN
(Olympia)



FIG. 2. MARSYAS, AFTER MYRON
Wrongly restored



FIG. 3. CENTAUR AND LAPITH WOMAN
(Metope, Parthenon)




FIG. 3. CHOISEUL-GOUFFIER "APOLLO"




FIG. 2. CHARIOTEER OF DELPHI



FIG. 1. "APOLLO" WITH THE OMPHALOS



FIG. 1. RESTORED TEMPLE OF AIGINA



FIG. 2. THE PARTHENON



FIG. 3. FIGURES OF EAST PEDIMENT OF PARTHENON



FIG. 4. FIGURES OF EAST PEDIMENT OF PARTHENON



FIG. 1. DYING WARRIOR, AIGINA



FIG. 2. DYING WARRIOR, AIGINA (cast with arm removed)



FIG. 3. "KLADEOS" (Olympia)



FIG. 4. "KEPHIASSOS" (Parthenon)

PLATE XIV




FIG. 1. THE PEDIMENTS OF THE TEMPLE OF ZEUS, OLYMPIA




FIG. 2. CARREY'S DRAWINGS OF THE PEDIMENTS OF THE PARTHENON



FIG. 3. TYPHON ("Blue Beard")



FIG. 4. CENTER, EAST PEDIMENT, OLYMPIA

PLATE XV



FIG. 2. NORTH CORNER, East Pediment, Olympia



FIG. 1. CENTER, West Pediment, Aigina



FIG. 4. FRAGMENTS FROM ARGOS



FIG. 3. MARBLENS (East Frieze, Parthenon)



FIG. 2. HERA OF ARGOS
Wrong view



FIG. 1. PEIRITHOÖS (Olympia)
Wrong view




FIG. 4. PLAN OF PARTHENON FRIEZE



FIG. 3. APOBATES (North Frieze, Parthenon)

PLATE XVII



FIG. 1. LEMNIAN ATHENA



FIG. 2. "CARYATID" FROM ERECHTHEION




FIG. 1. "THESEUS" (East Pediment, Parthenon)



FIG. 2. HELIOS (East Pediment, Parthenon)




FIG. 3. SELENE'S HORSE (East Pediment, Parthenon)



FIG. 1. NIOBE CHIARAMONTI



FIG. 2. "NIKE" (East Pediment, Parthenon)



FIG. 3. IRIS (East Pediment, Parthenon)

PLATE XX



FIG. 1



FIG. 2



FIG. 3

SLABS FROM NORTH FRIEZE OF THE PARTHENON

FIG. 4




FIG. 1. METOPE FROM THE PARTHENON



FIG. 2. METOPE FROM THE PARTHENON




FIG. 1. DORYPHOROS (SPEAR BEARER),
AFTER POLYKLEITOS



FIG. 2. VAISOS DIADOUMENOS (MAN TYING
FILLET), AFTER POLYKLEITOS




FIG. 3. DELIAN DIADOUMENOS, AFTER
POLYKLEITOS

PLATE XXIII



FIG. 1. HEAD OF DORYPHOROS



FIG. 2. BRONZE HERME OF DORYPHOROS



FIG. 3. HEAD FROM ARGOS



FIG. 4. HEAD OF BELVEDERE APOLLO



FIG. 1. AMAZON (Berlin type)



FIG. 2. AMAZON (Capitoline type)




FIG. 3. AMAZON (Mattei type)



FIG. 2. NIKE (Balustrade, Athena-Nike Temple)



FIG. 1. CHARIOTEER (Small Frieze, Mausoleion)




FIG. 2. "APOLLO SAUROKTONOS" (Vatican copy)




FIG. 1. SATYR ("Marble Faun")



FIG. 1. "APOLLO SAUROKTONOS"
Louvre copy



FIG. 2. SATYR ("Marble Faun")
Louvre torso



FIG. 3. SATYR ("Marble Faun")
Vatican copy with preserved tail



FIG. 4. "APOLLO SAUROKTONOS"
Dresden copy




FIG. 2. KNIDIAN APHRODITE, AFTER PRAXITELES




FIG. 1. HERMES OF PRAXITELES

PLATE XXIX




FIG. 1. HERMES OF PRAXITELES
Side view



FIG. 2. KNIDIAN APHRODITE WITH MODERN
TIN GARMENT



FIG. 3. APOXYOMENOS, AFTER LYSIPPOS
Side view




FIG. 2. VATICAN MELEAGER



FIG. 1. HARVARD MELEAGER




FIG. 1. NIOBE AND DAUGHTER



FIG. 2. DRUM OF COLUMN (Temple, Ephesos)



FIG. 3. NIKE OF SAMOTHRACE

PLATE XXXII



FIG. 1. SLAB FROM AMAZON FRIEZE (Maussoleion)



FIG. 2. SLAB FROM AMAZON FRIEZE (Maussoleion)

PLATE XXXIII




FIG. 1. ALEXANDER SARCOPHAGUS




FIG. 2. LYCEAN SARCOPHAGUS



HEADS FROM ALEXANDER SARCOPHAGUS



FIG. 1. APHRODITE OF MELOS



FIG. 2. APHRODITE OF ARLES



FIG. 3. APHRODITE OF CAPUA



FIG. 4. NIKE OF BRESCIA




FIG. 2. ARTEMIS OF VERSAILLES




FIG. 1. THE BELVEDERE APOLLO




FIG. 2. GODDESS (Frieze, Pergamon Altar)



FIG. 1. LAOKOÖN GROUP




FIG. 1. LAOKOÖN




FIG. 2. ZEUS OTRICOLI



FIG. 3. ZEUS
Pergamon altar



FIG. 4. DEAD AMAZON
Pergamon school

PLATE XXXIX




FIG. 1. KNIDIAN APHRODITE
(Kaufmann head)




FIG. 2. WEBER OR DE LABORDE
HEAD




FIG. 3. HEAD FROM SOUTHERN SLOPE
OF AKROPOLIS (Athens)



FIG. 4. HEAD FROM PERGAMON

PLATE XL



FIG. 1. SON OF NIOBE



FIG. 2. THEMIS OF RHAMNOS



FIG. 3. KNIDIAN APHRODITE
Kaufmann head



FIG. 4. GIUSTINIANI
"HESTIA"





University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

OCT 14 1996

RECEIVED

APR 25 1996

ARTS LIBRARY

QL OCT 03 2000

REC'D C.L. JUN 20 '00

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 453 709 8

U